



Shelburne.



Shelburne.

11805. cc 27

AN
INTRODUCTION
TO THE
ART OF READING
WITH
ENERGY AND PROPRIETY.

BY
JOHN RICE. *K*

LONDON:
Printed for J. and R. TONSON, in the Strand.
MDCCLXV.

WILLIAM B. DICKENS

FOR THE OUTLINE
CONSIDER
BY HIS ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE
ART OF READING
IN CONDUCTING AND READING



ARTS AND PROGRESS

THIS INTRODUCTION

ON THE ART OF READING

LONDON

Printed by J. and R. T. LINDON, in the Strand.

TO

WILLIAM KENRICK Esq. *I.U.D.*

IN RETURN

FOR THE OBLIGATIONS,

CONFERED

BY HIS ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE,

IN CONCERTING AND EXECUTING

A PLAN

FOR IMPROVING THE PRACTICE OF READING,

AND ESTABLISHING

A CRITERION FOR THE PRONUNCIATION

OF THE ENGLISH TONGUE;

THIS INTRODUCTION IS GRATEFULLY

INSCRIBED

BY HIS MOST OBEDIENT

AND MOST OBLIGED

HUMBLE SERVANT

JOHN RICE.

TO

WILLIAM KENRICK ESQ. D.D.

C. O. V. T. S.

FOR THE COLLECTION

CONTAINED

IN HIS ADDRESS AND ASSISTANCE

TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Reading



FOR THE PURPOSE OF READING

AND

ACQUISITION OF THE PROPOSITION

Section I. OF THE PROPOSITION

Section II. OF THE PROPOSITION

Section III. OF THE PROPOSITION

Section IV. OF THE PROPOSITION

Section V. OF THE PROPOSITION

Section VI. OF THE PROPOSITION

Section VII. OF THE PROPOSITION

Section VIII. OF THE PROPOSITION

English

Latin

C O N T E N T S.

C H A P. I.

*Observations on the Defects and Perfection of
Reading in general.* I

C H A P. II.

The Analysis of SPEECH.

SECT. I. *Of Speech in general.* 19

SECT. II. *Of the vocal Part of Speech.* ib.

SECT. III. *Of the Modulation of SPEECH,
and the Distinction between SPEAKING
and SINGING.* 21

SECT. IV. *Of ARTICULATION, or the
Times and Powers of distinct Voices.* 31

SECT. V. *Of the Length of Syllables in
English.* 36
SECT.

SECT. VI. *Rules for determining the natural Length of articulate Voices or Syllables.* 45

SECT. VII. *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.* 54

SECT. VIII. *Of the Seat of the Accent, and its pretended Use in the Formation of Words.* 76

SECT. IX. *Of the Number, Diversity, and proper Use of Accents.* 82

SECT. X. *Of the Power and Use of Accent in the Quantity of Verse.* 99

SECT. XI. *Of English Numbers, or metrical Feet.* 114

SECT. XII. *On the Mechanism and Harmony of English Verse.* 143

CHAP. III.

Of the sentimental or significant Part of Speech, with the natural and artificial Relations and Connections of Sense and Sound.

SECT. I. *Of the general Resemblance between Sense and Sound, in Speaking or Reading.* 184

SECT.

CONTENTS.

ivii

SECT. II. *Of the Difference between spoken and written Language, and the true Criterion of simple Pronunciation.* 193

SECT. III. *Of the Nature and Use of Emphasis in general.* 196

SECT IV. *Of the Abuse of Emphasis.* 202

SECT V. *Of Pause, Cadence, Tone and Gesture.* 230

CHAP. IV.

Of the Application of the preceding Rules and Observations to the Recital of the different Species of literary Composition.

SECT. I. *Of grammatical Construction, and the natural Order of Words.* 354

SECT II. *Of simple Narrative, or mere Relation.* 362

SECT. III. *Of Description.* 366

SECT. IV *Of Preaching, Pleading, and other publick Speaking.* 379

SECT.

SECT. V. *Of Theatrical Declamation, or the Art of reciting dramatic Compositions.* 290

A P P E N D I X.

The Sketch of a Plan for establishing a Criterion, by which the Pronunciation of Languages may be ascertained; and, in particular that of the English Tongue, reduced to a Certain fixt Standard. 307

23 OC 62

VI. CHAP. IV.

AN

A N
INTRODUCTION
TO THE
ART OF READING
WITH
ENERGY and PROPRIETY.

C H A P. I.

*Observations on the Defects and Perfection
of Reading in general.*

IT is remarkable, that among the numerous Writers on the Arts of *Speaking* and *Writing*, there are few or none who have treated professedly on that of *Reading*.

We have, indeed, many Books which treat cursorily of the *Pronunciation* of particular Languages: But the *Pronunciation*,

B

or

or Method of *Sounding* the particular *Words* of a Language, is acquired by *Habit*, and not by *Art* *: And it is possible (at least we may conceive) that a Man may be able to pronounce every Word of a Language in the most unexceptionable Manner, who might, nevertheless, be incapable of *Reading* † any Language whatever.

Again, we have Tracts on the Art of *Speaking*; but neither *Reading* nor *Speaking* is confined to *mere Sound*. A Person can with no more Propriety be said to *speak* than to *read* a Language he does not *understand*. Indeed, the Writers on the Art of *Speaking* are, for the most Part, so far from confining it to the mere Exercise of the Faculty of *Speech*, that they extend it so far as to include the Arts of corporeal *Gesture* and intellectual *Design* or *Compo-*

* At least, if there are People ingenious in their Way, who can facilitate the Acquisition of this Habit, their Art is not yet regularly admitted into the Encyclopedia.

† A Man may possibly learn to pronounce Latin, Greek and Hebrew, as was the Case with the Daughters of Milton, who are said to have read to him in those Languages when he was blind; but *Reading*, as an *Art*, is not understood in that Sense, in which People may be said to *read* what they do not *comprehend*.

sition;

sition; so that, according to their Notions, no one can be said to *speak well*, who is not at the same Time a good Actor, and a good Writer: And, indeed, it is allowed, these two Characters must enter into that of a compleat Orator.

A Reader, however, need neither be a Writer nor an Actor, much less a finished Orator. By the Art of Reading, to which this Essay is intended as an Introduction, is meant simply the Art of *Pronunciation* in general, or that of *intelligibly* and *emphatically* repeating or rehearsing what is *written* in any Language: No Patavinity or Provinciality of Dialect*, which is merely local and transitory, interfering with an Art, established on the fundamental Principles of all Language.

The

* This may, indeed, in some Cases, be so great as to render such Lecture almost unintelligible; but the discerning Reader cannot mistake the Author's Meaning. He supposes his Pupil capable of pronouncing every Word in this respect unexceptionably; it not being his Design to teach People their Alphabet or Spelling Book. It is true, no Person can be said to *speak gracefully* or elegantly who retains any Vulgarity or provincial Peculiarity of Pronunciation. This Defect, however, is more justly excuseable, if not more easily remedied, than any Deficiency in Emphasis. The Business of the present Essay, is rather to

4 *On the Defects and Perfection*

The Art of Reading, as here defined, may, at first View, seem very easily attainable; on a very little Reflection, however, it will be discerned, that the Narrative of the Historian, the Descriptions of the Poet, and the Declamations of the Orator, are not to be intelligibly repeated, without some Portion of the Sense and Spirit of all three.

A mere audible Recital of the Words of any Author, as it may be made by a Person who doth not understand what he says, so it may be made also in such a Manner as not to be understood by those who hear him; or if not *totally* unintelligible, be at least but *imperfectly* or *falsely* understood; whereas the Art of READING consists in *conveying* to the *Hearer* the *whole Meaning* of the *Writer*.

To this End, it is evidently necessary that the Reader should himself understand what he reads, before he can possibly re-

shew the Use and Means of Reading intelligibly than Speaking gracefully. Persons may read with Propriety, who do not speak elegantly; but no Person can be Master of graceful Lecture, or Repetition, without first having acquired the Art of Reading intelligibly and emphatically.

peat it intelligibly to others. This is the first and indisputable Qualification of a Reader ; without which, the most articulate Pronunciation, with all the Artifices of Tone, Look or Gesture, will avail nothing, or only serve to mislead the Hearer; the Orator, Actor and Reader, being all understood to *say*, what they appear to *mean*, rather than what they *literally* utter *.

Now, as the mere Reader hath no other Means of conveying the Meaning of the Writer than by vocal Utterance or Pronunciation, so these Means are the least equivocal of all others, and the surest Criterion of a clear Understanding in the one, and Preciseness of Expression in the other : For it is here to be observed, that what is *ill written* can never be *well read*; for which Reason we should not be too ready to censure the indifferent Readers of indifferent Writings.

It is very certain, however, that there are Persons of most excellent Understand-

* As a Proof of this, might be quoted a Number of Passages, literally harmless and inoffensive ; which may nevertheless be so spoken as to inflame the Hearer with the most sudden and impetuous Resentment.

ings, and who perfectly comprehend what they read, and yet are incapable of audibly conveying to others the Meaning they so well comprehend; and this not from any Ignorance of Language, or Defect in their Faculties of Speech; but for Want of having properly cultivated them by an Attention to the Art in Question.

Emphasis is to the *Reading* a Language, what *Syntaxis* is to the *Writing* it; the precise Meaning of what is read or written depending respectively on *Pronunciation* and *Construction* *.

Now it is remarkable that all Persons, the most illiterate not excepted, when they speak with Energy in Conversation, generally pronounce, or emphasize, their

* It is presumed, from this Analogy between *Reading* and *Writing*, that the Observations contained in this Work, may be of some Service also to Writers, by inducing them to pay Attention to the Manner in which their Works may be recited; a Circumstance that will necessarily improve and meliorate their Style, whether they compose in Prose or Verse. It hath been observed by some Writers on this Subject, that Poets may be able to arrange their Words properly in Metre, according to the Rules of Versification, even if they were ignorant of the proper Accent and Emphasis of Words. Such Poetry could not fail, however, of being extremely defective; for the Reasons hereafter assigned.

Discourse

Discourse with great Propriety †: And yet there are few, who, in reciting what is written, do not greatly differ in their manner of pronouncing the same Sentences. Nay, some have been known to speak, with great Energy and Propriety, those very Words, which, being taken down, and afterwards shewn to them in Writing or Print, they have not been able, without great Difficulty, and after repeated Trials, to pronounce in the precise Tone and Manner in which they had uttered them.

It appears, from this Circumstance, that if the Reader could make the Words and Sentiments of the Writer his own, he would deliver a *written Lecture* with the same Propriety as he utters his own Discourse; his Reading having the same Precision and Energy as his Conversation. Thus a good Actor, who perfectly comprehends his Author, and enters into the Spirit of the Cha-

† This Rule is not, indeed, without some Exceptions. These, however, are very few, and consist only of such phraseological Expressions as we make Use of, without attending to the particular Energy of all the Words composing them; attending only to the general and arbitrary Sense of the Whole.

rafter he affumes, will recite exactly as he would converse. In this Case, however, the *Player* really does make the Words and Sentiments of the Writer his own ; which it is not the Business of a *Reader* to do. A Person may, by due Attention, become an excellent Reader, and yet have no other Qualification of an Actor whatever ; at the same Time it is notorious, that some tolerable Actors are but very indifferent Readers. The Reason of this is, that the Actor enters into the Spirit of his Character, before he hath sufficiently studied the Meaning of his Author ; and thus may personate such Character with great Propriety in general, while he perverts the Sense of particular Passages, for Want of a due Attention to the peculiar Construction and Meaning of each Sentence. Were a good Actor also a just Reader, he would certainly excel all other Readers ; as that would be habitual to him, which in others must be the Effect of Art ; than which nothing is more difficult, and at the same Time more necessary to conceal.

As the Art of Reading does not consist, like that of Acting, in really adopting the
Words

Words and Sentiments of the Writer; it is sufficient, that the Reader recite what is written in such a Manner, that the Auditors, at the Time of Hearing, might conceive it then first spoken by the Person reciting; or at least in such a Manner as the Person, first speaking it, would naturally have uttered it.

Now, this Art hath been hitherto so greatly neglected, that few Writers have advanced any Thing satisfactory on the Subject; not one having laid down Rules professedly with the View here pointed out. Precepts enough have been given to qualify Players and Orators: But this is beginning at the wrong End, and is almost as bad as a Musician's attempting to teach Persons to play in Time and Tune, before they can sound simple Notes.

Reading may, with Propriety, be called artificial Speaking; as it is, indeed, the Imitation of natural Eloquence. Hence, like all other imitative Arts, its End is defeated by every Appearance of Study, Habit, or Affectation. Any Peculiarity of Tone and Manner of Reading, therefore, must be disgusting, as it is unnatural;

ral ; in like Manner the studied Artifices of *Declamation* are equally exceptionable, and for the same Reason.

It is nevertheless very certain that, as there are few common Readers, who have not a disagreeable habitual Tone ; so there are few pretended Adepts in this Art, who are not mere Declaimers.

It is difficult to say which of the two are most intolerable : It is plain, however, that as the former must get rid of his acquired Habit, so the latter must unlearn almost all he hath learned, before he can possibly be a good Reader.

Before any Rules indeed can be laid down for the Study of this Art, it is necessary to eradicate those Prejudices which will prevent People from profiting by them.

The great Source of vicious Habits in Reading, is the erroneous Method of teaching Children to *read* before they learn to *write*, or the making them *recite* what they do not *understand*. I should be glad to know of what Use it is, to teach Children to gabble over a Parcel of Words, the Meaning of which they do
not

not comprehend, as is almost universally the Custom, unless it be with a Design that the little Prattlers may divert their Parents something more agreeably than mere Perroquets. Of this, at least, I am certain, that it would be of great Utility, in more Ways than one, if Children were not taught to pronounce their Letters, till they were taught to delineate them; and that they should first learn to write and read their own Words and Sentiments*, and not recite or copy those of others. There is not a more vicious Custom, in

* These might be objected to, as not always grammatical and just.—No Matter: let the ill Construction of their Language, and the Impropriety of their Sentiments, be gradually corrected together: By which Means they may also acquire a Stile, or Method of expressing themselves on any Subject with Ease, and in *their own Way*. Whereas, at present, there are comparatively but few Persons capable of committing their Sentiments to Paper with Facility and Propriety: Add to this, that they almost all write in the same Manner; their common Letters on Business or Pleasure running all in the same Strain; being composed of the Phrases and Turns of Expression, taken from popular Writers, or those generally in Use. Nor is this only the Case with the Unlearned; our classical Scholars having, for the most Part, as little Stile of their own, as the Illiterate: Their Verses being little better than *Centos*, and their prose Writings a strange Jargon or Mixture of different Idioms and Scholastic Phraseology.

the

the whole Practice of modern Education, than that of setting Youth to get Verses, or Declamations, and to repeat them by Rote. This Custom, I know, is adopted with a View to exercise the Memory; but, setting aside the Absurdity of exercising the Memory with the Retention of mere *Sounds*, it is very certain that a vacant Mind will retain *Things* much better than one which is overcharged with superfluous Ideas; and perhaps this Vacuity is one Reason why the Memory is better in Youth than in Age. Be this, however, as it will, it is at all Ages much easier to learn to remember, than to learn to forget: And yet the latter is full as necessary as the former; young Persons finding themselves, on entering into Life, more bewildered by the Prejudices of their Education (i. e. what they remember to have been *taught*) than from their real Ignorance of the World, or what they have still to *learn*. And hence it is, that in applying the Acquisitions made in their Education to any good Purpose, they are obliged to throw aside, and to forget the greater Part of them.

It

It may seem strange, that I should dissuade Preceptors from teaching Children to read till they teach them to write, and at the same Time to write and read their own Expressions; the Reasons for it, however, are very obvious; as, by so doing, Children will acquire so strong a Sense of that Analogy which subsists between Reading and Speaking, that they can never fall into the vicious Habits of reciting otherwise than they converse: In which Case, nothing more would be requisite to enable them to read any Work with Propriety, than the perfect Comprehension of the Author's Sense; which is not, as before observed, altogether sufficient for grown Persons at present.

To eradicate entirely a vicious Habit of Pronunciation must be the Work of Time: It is requisite, however, that such as are desirous of being cured of it, should look upon it in the Light of a Prejudice, and apply themselves to the Study of proper Rules, and be constant in the Practice of them.

As to the Vices of Declamation, they may also be called Habits; but, if more lately

lately acquired, are the more easily exterminable. The great Obstacle to the Removal of these, is the strong Persuasion of their Propriety: There is a wide Difference, however, between Artifice and Art; between the Knack of exhibiting a false Image, and the Power of imitating the real one of Nature. Persons will not easily give up a Defect while they esteem it a Beauty: Thus it would be no easy Matter to persuade an Actor, that he might play the lowest Parts in Comedy, and the sublimest of Tragedy, without altering the natural Tone of his Voice. No! in the one he must roar like Thunder, and in the other squeak like a Puppet.

The Story of the Painter who made his Pictures *fine*, because he could not make them *beautiful*, is well known: There are others, who to represent Men *great*, make them *big*: The Tragedian, in like manner, to give himself the Dignity of a Hero, whips on high-heel Shoes, struts and talks *loud*.

Next to the intolerable Cacophony of the Whine and Cant of the Illiterate

rate

rate *, the Monotony of the artificial Declaimer is most disgustful: Not that he may want Variety in the Inflections of his Voice; but these are made to succeed each other so regularly, that whatever he be repeating, it seems to be still the Burthen of the same Song †.

This Error may be imputed, in a great Degree, to their dealing generally in Poetry and Blank Verse. It is, nevertheless, a very whimsical Reason for mouthing out the Writings of an Author, because they consist of Couplets, or are printed in Lines of ten Syllables.

* I use the Word *Illiterate* here only for Want of a better; as it is very certain, that there are Gentlemen of profound Learning who make as bad a Figure in this Respect, as the most illiterate of the whining Ministers of a Country Conventicle. *Gannimus Docti Indoctique.*

† The Declamations of some of our Tragedians, indeed, greatly resemble the homotonous *ti dum ti* of the Recitative in our modern Operas; the Music to which is, for the most Part, so horribly composed, that the Words can hardly ever be understood by the Audience. And how should it be otherwise, when the Composer (whatever may be his Pretensions to Singing, or Judgment in Music) is usually so incapable of *Reading*, and so ignorant of *Prosody*, as to make long Syllables short, short ones long, and so to misplace the Accent and Emphasis of the Whole, as to render it totally unintelligible?

And

And yet there is hardly one Reader in ten Thousand, who would sit down to recite a Tragedy, or Epic Poem, with that Ease and Placidity of Countenance he would naturally wear, in repeating a Paragraph in a common News-paper. The Lines drawn up in Rank and File, with a capital Initial at the Head of each, look formidable, and seem to demand a peculiar Degree of Sound and Energy.

Hence it is that we see, on these Occasions, the very Features of the Reader assume a new Form; an Air of consequential Gravity settles on his Brow, his Cheeks swell, and his Lips, forming the *Os magna Sonaturum*, project with all the ridiculous Importance imaginable.

Will it be objected, that “if Verse were
“to be recited like Prose, with a strict
“Attention to the Sense of the Author,
“and a very slight one to the Numbers;
“the Harmony of those Numbers would
“be lost?”——By no Means. Preserve the Sense, and depend on it all the *true* Harmony will be preserved with it.

By *true Harmony*, I mean that only which is consistent with Propriety; the most flowing Numbers losing all their Effect,

fect, if they do not properly accompany the Sense of the Words *.

In Prose, the Harmony of the Periods necessarily accompanies this Sense, as it is constituted by the natural Succession or Combination of the Accents or Emphasis of the several Words composing such Periods. In like manner, in reading Poetry, if the Numbers interfere with the Harmony of the Period, there is a Defect in the Composition: For though the Harmony of prosaic Periods is different, or will admit of greater Latitude and Variety, than those of Poetry; yet the Laws of Diction require that the Sense and Meaning of the Writer should be consistent with both †.

On

* Smoothness, or an easy Flow of Stile, is but one Species of this Harmony, which does not consist in the simple Melody of Sound; but in the Accordance of the Sound and Sense of every Period. The Numbers therefore must be smooth or rough, mild or vehement, quick or slow, as the Subject varies and requires.—This Matter is considered more at large in the following Sheets.

† With regard to the Monotony which attends the Repetition of Couplets, where the Sense and Sound keep Time exactly together; it is made much more disagreeable than is necessary, by the Neglect of the Poets to introduce that Variety of Numbers of which the Couplet is

C

capable

18 *On the Defects and Perfection, &c.*

On the Whole, as it would be doing the greatest Injustice to the Poets, to make Nonsense of their Writings, because they have not been always so happy as to make the Sound echo to the Sense; so it would be paying a very bad Compliment to their divine Art, to pretend that, in reciting Poetry, it is at any Time necessary to sacrifice Sense to Sound *.

capable. Our most harmonious and correctest Poets have fallen into this Neglect; and particularly Mr. Pope, whose Verses are for the most Part composed of Hemistichs, which necessarily occasion a most unnecessary Homotony. But of this hereafter.

* If indeed the Sound is the better of the two, as is not unfrequently the Case with the minor Poets, it may not be improper to neglect the worst: It being a Matter of very little Importance how Nonsense is recited.

C H A P. II.

The Analysis of SPEECH.

SECT. I. *Of Speech in general.*

THE Art of Reading consisting in a just and unaffected Imitation of natural Speech, it is expedient to enter first into a short Analysis of the Subject imitated: At least, so far as the Relation it bears to the imitative Art is concerned.

Speaking may, with Propriety, be distinguished into *vocal* and *sentimental*, agreeable to the two distinct Parts of its Composition, *Sound* and *Sense*: The former immediately respecting the *Matter*, or common Subject of Speech in general; the latter regarding the *Significancy* and *Energy* of particular Languages.

SECT. II. *Of the vocal Part of Speech.*

The vocal Part of Speech, consists in a distinct Succession of articulate Sounds or Voices, which being intended to express and communicate our Affections of Ideas,

20 *Of the vocal Part of Speech.*

must, to that End, be necessarily uttered with *Precision* and *Energy*.

Now, it is not only impossible for us to speak with Energy and Precision (in other Words, to make ourselves clearly understood) by a *regular* Succession of *uniform* and *unvaried* Sounds*; but it is equally impossible for the Organs to utter more than a certain Number of those articulate Sounds, without making some Rest or Pause in the Pronunciation.

As there are also some Sounds more emphatical, or expressive of more forcible Affections or Impressions than others, so the Voice will either dwell *longer* on those

* The Ear cannot be long pleased with one and the same Sound continued, nor *different Impressions* be made upon the Soul by the same Motions and Percussions of the Air: Therefore *Nature*, or the *Reason of Things*, has instructed the Voice in every Language not to move by uniform Sounds.

Let us pronounce, for Instance, the ten following Syllables with one perpetual Tenor of the Voice, unchanged alike in *Tune* or in *Accent*,



Be what you will so you be still the same, and they will appear like sord and unmeaning Sounds.

SAY, on the Harmony, Variety and Power of Numbers:
Sounds,

SECT. III. *Of the Modulation of SPEECH,*
and the Distinction between SPEAKING
and SINGING.

I am not to learn that the Ancients, as well as some learned and ingenious Critics among the Moderns, have supposed a Kind of musical Cadence, as applicable in a certain Degree to *Speaking* and *Reading*, as to *vocal* and even *instrumental* Music.

C₃

dulation

dulation of Tone or Tune from the former.

We are told by Lord Kaimes, in his Elements of Criticism, that the five Vowels, with the same Extension of Windpipe, but with different Openings of the Mouth, form a regular Series of Sounds, descending from high to low in the following Order, i, e, a, o, u. His Lordship gives it also as the Opinion of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, that, in pronouncing *i. e.* without altering the Aper-
ture of the Windpipe, the Voice may vary, and extend itself to any Distance within the Compass of three Notes and a Half.

But if the Anatomists be not mistaken, the Tone of the Voice is compleatly formed before it reach the Mouth, and is not by Articulation made either more *grave* or *acute*. I do not therefore conceive how either the Opinion of Dionysius, or the Assertion of his Lordship, can be true, — Indeed, in distinguishing *Pronunciation* from *Singing*, Lord Kaimes himself observes, “ the *latter* is carried on by Notes, “ requiring each of them a different Aper-
“ ture of the Windpipe: While the
“ Notes belonging to the *former* are ex-
“ pressed

“ pressed by different Apertures of the
“ Mouth, without varying the Aperture
“ of the Windpipe *.”

His most ingenious Friend, however, the Author of *Hermes*, asserts, with the Anatomists, that Articulation does not alter the Tone; but that “ Articulation is, “ in fact, nothing else than that Form or “ Character, acquired to simple Voice, “ by Means of the Mouth and its several “ Organs, the Teeth, the Tongue, the “ Lips†, &c.” Now, if this be the Case, and the Voice, after coming from the Trachea, be made neither more grave nor acute in Articulation, what Kind of *Notes* can those be, which his Lordship supposes are formed by the Apertures of the Mouth? Neither a *higher* nor *lower* Note can proceed from the Lips of the Mouth, than first proceeds from the Lips of the *Glottis*.

He is mistaken therefore in supposing the Voice, in passing through the Cavity of the Mouth, acquires by Articulation a

* See *Elements of Criticism*, Vol. ii. Page 263. second Edition.

† *Hermes*, or a Philosophical Enquiry concerning Language and Universal Grammar, Book iii. Chap. 2.

different Tone. It is true in general, as he affirms, "that the Air, in passing thro' Cavities, differing in Size, produceth various Sounds, some high, or sharp, some low and flat : That a small Cavity occasions a high Sound, and a large Cavity a low Sound." His Lordship, however, forgets to take along with him the *Velocity* with which it is necessary the Air should pass through those Apertures, before it can possibly occasion any Sound at all, in its Passage.

Dodart with the rest of the Physiologists, give us a Reason why the Tone of the Voice is formed at the Glottis. Its Aperture is so very small, in Comparison with the Width of the Trachea, that the Air can never get out of the latter without a prodigious Compression, and of course an Augmentation of its Velocity ; by which Means, in passing, it communicates an Agitation to the minute component Parts of the Lips of the Glottis, to which it gives a Kind of Spring, causing them to make those Vibrations in the passing Air which occasions the Sound.

Now it is very evident that, in Articulation, the vibrating Air is never so compressed

pressed as to acquire a Degree of Velocity capable of altering the Tone it acquired in passing through the very small Aperture * of the Glottis. On the contrary, there is a vast Disproportion between that Aperture and the Cavity of the Mouth, where Sound hath Room to vibrate at large. Indeed, it might as well be pretended, that the Tone of the Voice must be altered in passing through a Casement, an Entry, or Anti-chamber, as that it may be changed from grave to acute, in passing from the Trachea through the Mouth. Such Notes or Sounds may indeed, by Articulation, be rendered *longer* or *shorter*, *stronger* or *weaker*; but the Tone thereof will remain *unvaried*.

There is this Difference between a musical Tone and an articulate Sound; that the former is characterized, and takes its Effect from the Velocity of the Vibrations which cause it, without regard to the *Sum* or *Duration* of those Vibrations: Whereas the Effect of an articulate Sound depends not only on the Velocity of such Vibrations, or the Number of them in

* About One-tenth of an Inch,

any given Time, but on the *whole Sum* of such Vibrations; or, if I may so venture to express it, the *Momentum* of the *whole Voice*.

Hence, if a Word, spoken in a low Key or Tone, whose Vibrations are slow, did not longer affect the auditory Nerves than another Word spoken in a higher Key, it would be impossible they should make the same Degree of Impression, *i. e.* be equally articulate and distinct †.

I cannot therefore agree with this ingenious Critic, when he says, that “this Difference between Speaking and Singing doth not hinder Pronunciation to borrow from Singing, as a Man sometimes is naturally led to do, in expressing a vehement Passion.” For my Part,

† Let us suppose, for Instance, that the Sound of one Word was naturally an Octave higher than another; we should, in order to pronounce them equally audible and distinct, dwell *twice* as long upon the *lowest* as the *highest*. The Vibrations of a Chord being isochronal, the same Note is always sounded whether those Vibrations be *stopt* or continued; their Discontinuance affecting only the Length of the Note. But in Pronunciation it is necessary, that the Duration of a Sound should be proportionate to its Tone, in order to make it equally distinct with any other of a different Tone.

I must

I must own, I never saw People in a vehement Passion more propense to *sing* at those Times, than when they have been less agitated. I have heard them *rave* and *scold* on those Occasions most vociferously; but the Discords of harsh and smooth prevailed so much, that I could discover no Traces of the Melody of *Singing*.

I agree with his Lordship that, in Reading as well as Singing, there is a Key-Note. But then I conceive its Influence is confined to a Sentence, or capital Part of a Sentence, or Period; and that the Key is changed in Reading as the *Subject* varies: Not that the Voice is elevated and depressed on the particular Words of a Sentence pronounced in that *Key*; much less do I think that the Voice, at the Close of a Sentence, should, in order to a Rest, as he says, be brought down to the said Key-Note, in the Way of *Cadence*. One of the greatest Faults in *Reading*, is the Sinking the last Word of a Sentence; a Circumstance never observable in *natural Speech*, any further than as the last Syllable may be less forcible or emphatical than the rest. Nothing would be more preposterous

posterior than such a Sinking, merely for the Sake of a musical Cadence.

Agreeable to this, Quintilian, in treating of Pronunciation, says, that “ a skilful Master will take Care his Pupil doth not suffer the last Syllables of a Word or Sentence to *sink*; that the *Whole* of his Discourse may be *alike* and *even*: When he is to exert his Voice, let it be known by its *Strength*.”

Thus we see this great Master of Elocution, recommended Evenness of Tone and Strength of Voice; not Variety of musical Cadence. By adopting the latter, indeed, we should, with consummate Refinement, place *Reading* on a Foot with *Recitative* in Music; but till *Speaking* be *Chanting*, and our ordinary Discourse resemble the Service of a Cathedral, I must remain of Opinion, that the Variations of *high* and *low* have nothing to do with particular Syllables in Speaking or Reading.

The *Modulation* of the Voice in Pronunciation consists, then, *First*, in the proper Diversification of Key at the Beginning of every Sentence, or capital Part of a Sentence, when the Subject is diversified,

fified. In which Manner only the Diversity of *high* and *low* should take place in Speaking or Reading.

Secondly, In the Varieties of long or short, or swift and slow, applicable both to the articulate Sounds themselves, and to the Intervals of their Succession. Because some Syllables necessarily take up more Time in the Pronunciation than others, on Account of the Letters composing them : Some Words in a Sentence are less important than others, and therefore not so long to be dwelt on. And, lastly, Sentences require to be repeated quicker or slower, according to the Nature of the Subject, or their Importance in the Discourse or Composition.

Thirdly, In the Diversifications of *strong* or *weak*, *loud* or *soft*, both Words and Sentences require a forcible or emphatical Pronunciation, according to their natural Energy and Importance.

To these different Species of vocal Modulation might be added those of *harsh* and *smooth*: But as this doth not depend so much on the Speaker and Reader, as on the Form of the Language he speaks, and
the

the Choice of Words in the Writer, I shall here pass it over.

As to the Change of Key, or the Tone of Voice, in Pronunciation: This, being governed entirely by the *Sense*, cannot be reduced to any of the mechanical Rules relative to the Melody, or the harmonious Succession, of single Sounds; this Diversity of Tone by no Means constituting that regular Variation of *long* and *short*, *strong* and *weak* Sounds, which have so pleasing an Effect in the Compositions of our Orators and Poets.

Its Beauties are, indeed, of a superior Nature, and are often productive of the most striking Effects, by interfering or breaking through that metrical Succession or mechanical Regularity of Sounds. Sudden, impetuous, and uncontrollable as the Passions it accompanies, its Transitions frequently surprize, alarm, and confound the Hearer with agreeable Astonishment. This Subject, however, will be more properly considered under the *significant* than the *vocal* Part of Speech.

With regard to the Varieties of *long* and *short*, *strong* and *weak* in Modulation, they
come

come under this Head only as they effect the several articulate Sounds themselves; The swift or slow Succession of these Sounds depending on the *sentimental* or significant Part of Pronunciation.

SECT. IV. *Of ARTICULATION, or the Times and Powers of distinct Voices.*

The Business of *Articulation*, is to make a Distinction in Sounds, be their Tone what it will, thereby to give a distinct and audible Utterance to all the several Voices of which the Words of a Language are composed.

By the articulate Voices of a Language, I do not only mean the simple elementary Sounds, which are few *; but also the infinite Number of Syllables compounded of them, if single, or productive only of one simple Sound †.

The

* Buffier says there are Twenty-four simple Sounds in the English Language, Twenty in the Spanish, Twenty-nine in the Italian, Thirty in the German, and Thirty-three in the French.

† Lord Kaims, indeed, says, that every articulate Sound into which a Consonant enters, must necessarily be double, though pronounced with one Expiration of the
Air,

The Pronunciation of the elementary Sounds of a Language is, to Speaking and Reading, what the Practice of Sol-fa-ing is in Singing; it being as necessary for the Speaker or Reader to be able to pronounce distinctly each Letter of the Alphabet, as for a Singer to Sound every Note in the Scale of Music. As there is no Melody or Harmony also in the uniform Utterance of equal Notes; so there is (as before observed) no Sense or Expression to be gathered from the uniform Utterance of furd and unmeaning Sounds: And yet as these are the fundamental and constituent Parts of vocal Speech, their Nature and Efficacy come first under Consideration.

Few as these elementary Sounds are in most Languages, they are not in all exactly the same, notwithstanding the Europeans make Use of similar Letters or Types to express these Elements in general.

Air, or with one Breath. The Reason, however, which he gives for it is, that Consonants being pronounced with a less Cavity of the Mouth than Vowels, they are of a different Tone.

But this Doctrine being refuted in the preceding Section, the Inference drawn from it of Course falls to the Ground.

Dif-

Different Nations frequently annex a different Sound to the same Type; hence arises, in a great Measure, that Perplexity and Confusion among the Learned of different Countries, when they converse together in the dead Languages: As also the great Difficulty Foreigners meet with in learning the Language of their Contemporaries *. Now the different Articulation of a Sound doth not depend on its Tone; it being possible to pronounce a Word as distinctly in a *low*, as in a *high*, Tone of Voice †.

* Thus the French never pronounce the *Theta* of the Greeks, as the English and some other Nations do. Again, the English pronounce the Latin different from almost all other Nations. *Cæcus*, for Instance, they pronounce *Sekus*; while the Italians, on the other Hand, pronounce it *Chekous*. In the German and Low Dutch, *G*, so hard in some English Words, is little more than an Aspirate, while the latter pronounce the double *o* in the Middle of a Word, which with us is sounded like an *ou*, as an English *o* long, as in *open*, *gore*, &c. Again, the Sound given by the English to the double *o*, is given by them to *oe*, as *goed*, *boer*, &c. which they pronounce as we do, *good*, *boor*.

† That is, within the Stretch or Compass of the Organs. Thus we say, a Spring unbends itself with the same Force with which it is bent: But it is always understood within a certain Degree, consistent with the Form and Elasticity of it.

D

To

To effect this, however, *i. e.* to pronounce a Word, in any Key, equally distinct and articulate, it is necessary that it should, in every Case, have the same Efficacy on the Ear; that is, if the Vibrations of its Tone be slow and grave, they should continue proportionably longer on the Ear, or be more often repeated than if they were quick and sharp, and *vice versa*. Hence arises the natural or mechanical Distinction between long and short Syllables; it being impossible to pronounce all the different articulate Voices of a Language in the same Tone, and equally distinct, without making them proportionably longer or shorter.

At the same Time, the Distinction of *loud* and *soft* arises from this very Circumstance: For if, in uttering two Sounds of the same Tone, the one be in Articulation made *long*, and the other *short*, they will not be equally *distinct*; but the long one will be heard so much *plainer*, as it will be heard *longer* than the other. For it is to be observed, that in human Speech, though the primary Organ of Sound acts as a simple Monochord; yet it is in our Power, by the Organs of Articulation, the
Tongue,

Tongue, Teeth and Lips, to shorten the Utterance, and thereby put an End to the Sounds when we please, just as the Vibrations of the Strings of an Harpsichord are stopt by taking the Fingers off the Keys.

—It is notorious, that single articulate Sounds or Voices, if pronounced in the same Time, would differ from each other in Tone: To pronounce them, therefore, equally distinct, with the same Aperture of the *Glottis*, or in the *same Tone*, they must in course differ both in *Length* and *Force*: And if pronounced equally *long* and *loud*, they will necessarily require to be uttered in different Tones, or with different Apertures of the *Glottis*.

Now that Succession of Sounds, which is carried on by the different Tones, constitutes Singing, so that in *Speaking* and *Reading*, the same Time being preserved *; the several articulate Voices made Use of,

* Agreeable to what is above intimated, during a *Sentence*, or such Part of a Discourse as may not require a *Variation* in the Key. A Variation of Keys is, indeed, admitted in the Composition of Music, and is almost as little subject to Rule, and as much detached from the mechanical Principles of Melody, as that I would endeavour to establish in Reading.

are to be distinguished only by their *Length* and *Force* †.

SECT. V. *Of the Length of Syllables in English.*

The Difference between the elementary Sounds, or articulate Voices, in different Languages, is so very considerable, that, however general ought our Enquiries into this Subject to be, 'tis impossible to pursue them with any Advantage, without limiting them to one particular Language. As this Work, therefore, is in-

† In prescribing these Distinctions, however, it is not pretended, that in the Utterance of elementary Sounds and articulate Voices, *severally* and *distinct* from each other, we do not naturally pronounce them in different Tones. When we have no Regard to preserve the general Tone, or Key, of a Sentence or Discourse, it is as easy for us to vary the *Tone* as the *Time* of a Sound. Thus, in the Pronunciation of detached Monosyllables, their Difference in Point of Acuteness and Gravity is very sensible, unless we purposely preserve the Tone, to shew how its Distinction may be supplied by *Time* and *Force*. But when Syllables are joined in Sentences, and form a Discourse, their Difference in Tone is no longer observable: Tone only belonging to the Sentence or Discourse in general; the particular Voices of which are distinguishable only as they are *long* and *short*, *loud* or *soft*.

tended

tended more particularly for the Use and Emolument of those who are desirous of Speaking the English Tongue, and Reading our English Writers, I shall confine myself accordingly to my native Language.

Almost all those who have hitherto treated of English Profody, have contented themselves with the simple Division of Syllables into long and short; pretending that two short Syllables are, with respect to Time, precisely equal to a long one. Nay, some have gone so far as to assert, that no greater Variety of Time in pronouncing Syllables is at all necessary for any Kind of Verse.

It is admitted, indeed, that the Voice is frequently made to rest longer than commonly on a Word that bears an important Signification; but this, it is pretended, is done to humour the Sense, and is not necessary for Modulation *.

I hope

* See *Harris* on Painting and Poetry, Chap. iii.—Also *Say* on the Harmony of Numbers.—*Mason* on the same Subject.—Lord *Kaims's* Elements of Criticism, &c.—The latter observes (Vol. ii. Page 377.) that, sometimes to humour the Sense, and sometimes the Melody, a particular Syllable is sounded in a higher Tone; and this is

I hope to make it sufficiently plain, however, in the Course of this Work, that the Modulation of the Voice, so far as it concerns particular Words, in reciting either Prose or Verse, depends entirely on the *long* and *short*, *loud* and *soft* Manner of pronouncing Words, and not in the *high* and *low* Tones of those Words.

In illustrating this Doctrine, it will also be found, that Syllables are so far from being thus regularly divided into *long* and *short*, that they are naturally of various Lengths. What I mean by *naturally* of various Lengths, is, that they are so when Words are pronounced separately and unconnected with the rest of the Sentence. In

termed *accenting a Syllable*, or gracing it with an Accent. This method of accenting, continues this Writer, is opposed to *Cadence*.

Now there cannot be a greater Mistake, than to suppose accented Syllables always pronounced in a higher Tone than others. That they are pronounced louder, more forcibly, and sometimes longer than the rest, is very true: But nothing is more common than to find an accented Syllable in the very Place where this Writer conceives the Cadence should fall. In a word, *accented* Syllables are pronounced indifferently in all Tones, and, if pronounced aright, always in the same Tone as the other Words in the same Clause or Sentence.

the

the latter Case, it is notorious that a Syllable may, from Want of Significance, be made alternately long and short, in Comparison with others: *e. g.* the Monosyllables *in* and *Town*, pronounced severally and equally distinct, might possibly bear the Proportion above-mentioned, the former being about half as long as the latter.

But suppose it was asked, *WHERE have you been?* In the Answer, *I have been in TOWN*, it is plain their Difference, both in Length and Force, would be increased in a very great Proportion; the Word *in* being pronounced so softly and quickly as to be hardly audible.

Before I enter, however, on that Diversity of Length in Syllables, which is caused by their being united and modified into Words and Sentences, I shall consider their Nature as simple Sounds. And here it is to be previously observed, that notwithstanding I banish all Variety of *Tone* from Reading and Speaking, except that of Sentences immediately under the Influence of the Meaning of the Discourse; yet it is not pretended that all Syllables, or simple Sounds, are of the same Tone, or that we should not, in pronouncing

D 4

them

them *severally*, found one in a more grave or shrill Tone than another.

Let us pronounce, for Instance, the following five simple Voices, wherein each of the Vowels has the Sound most generally given it.



bat, bet, bit, bot, but.

We find that, in uttering these distinctly and severally, without having any Regard to a general Tone (as we always have in speaking a Sentence) we rise and fall in their Pronunciation when placed in this Order; by which Means it becomes very evident, that they are not all equally grave or acute. Let us place them in the following Order,



bit, bet, bat, bot, but.

In this Case the Voice regularly descends from the first to the last, the Syllable formed by the Vowel *i* being sharper than that formed by *u*.

How great the Intervals between these Tones really are, or whether they are all exactly

exactly equal, is not to the present Purpose. This is an Object that may be worth the Enquiry of a Composer of vocal Music. It is sufficient to the Purposes of *Reading*, to know that there are such Distinctions, and to suppose the Intervals equal.

It hath been already observed, that articulate Voices are not pronounced equally distinct, unless their Difference of *Gravity* be compensated by their *Time*; that is, unless a graver Sound be continued proportionably longer than an acute one, and *vice versa*.

Hence it is plain that, in the equally distinct and articulate Pronunciation of these several simple Sounds, they must all differ in Length; so that there must *at least* be Syllables of five different Lengths: And this is what I mean by the natural Length of Syllables.

How far, and in what Manner, this natural Measure is diversified in their Combination to form Words and Sentences, in which all the Voices must be pronounced in one Tone, will be explained hereafter.

But to proceed in the further Consideration of single Voices,

It

It is usually conceived, that all Monosyllables are single Sounds.

Scaliger and *Priscian* define a Syllable to be an Element, or a Comprehension of Letters falling under one Accent, and pronounced at once, or at one Motion of the Breath. Others have defined it as an articulate Voice of an individual Sound.

The Difficulty of judging of the Individuality or Singleness of a Sound is, however, in some Cases, very perplexing.

The Vowels, when uttered singly, are undoubtedly single Sounds; but when united with a Consonant, or with *more* than *one* Consonant, have frequently a double Sound.

This hath been accounted for, by pretending, that Consonants are pronounced with a less Cavity of the Mouth than the Vowels; and that, thence having a sharper Tone, they cannot be pronounced with a Vowel without forming a double Sound, notwithstanding both are pronounced with one Expiration of Air, or, as it is commonly called, with one Breath. This Reason, however, is founded on the Supposition, that the Tone of the Voice is altered by Articulation; which being false, the Reason

Reason of Course falls to the Ground. The true State of the Case is, that in the Pronunciation of some Syllables, the Utterance of the Consonant causes a Kind of a Reverberation of Sound in the Mouth. This is very evident in Syllables ending with Consonants that cannot be pronounced without closing the Lips, or throwing the Tongue against the Inside of the Teeth; by which means Part of the Breath, forming the Sound, remains within the Mouth, and is there stifled, or carried through the Nose. This is plainly experienced in the Pronunciation of the following Syllables, *eb, ed, el, em, en, et, &c.*

The same Reverberation may be experienced also, when the Consonant begins the Syllable, in which Case the Lips, or the Tongue, or Teeth, stop the Sound in the same Manner, till the succeeding Vowel sets it free, *e. g. ma, pa, fa, ta, &c.* this is still more palpable in Syllables beginning with two Consonants, as *blind, frame, place, &c.*

It is this Stoppage of the Voice in Articulation, that causes that Kind of double
Sound

Sound or half Echo, which, however indistinct, necessarily prolongs such Syllables.

This double Sound in Monosyllables is extremely observable when they end with two Consonants, and particularly two Liquids; as in *curl, furl, harm, warm, balm, calm, helm, turn, burn, morn, thorn, &c.* If the Penult, or last Letter but one, also be a Liquid, and the last a Mute, the Syllable will have a double Sound, though something fainter, as in *bilk, milk, cord, lord, scarf, wharf.*

Indeed, a Syllable ending with two Mutes, will, for the Reasons above given, sound double, though not so long as the former, as is exemplified in *dopt, lopt, brisk, gasp, lisp, &c.*

Again, Monosyllables ending with an *e* final, have evidently a double Sound when the Penult is a Liquid, particularly if it be an *r*, as *mire, fire, rare, tare, here, there, &c.*

Add to this, that Diphthongs always give the Syllable a Kind of double Sound; but if it deduce no other from the Consonants, this is but very weak; the different

rent Sounds of the Vowels meliorating, or mixing with each other much more readily than those of Consonants.

It is from these, and a Number of similar Observations, that I have ventured to deduce some general Rules respecting the *Time* naturally taken up in the Pronunciation of English Syllables.

SECT. VI. *Rules for determining the natural Length of articulate Voices or Syllables.*

From what hath been advanced in the preceding Section, the Reader will see that the Length of Syllables is not altogether arbitrary; but depends in a great Degree on the Acuteness or Gravity of the elementary Sounds of which they are composed.

It is true, that Custom hath authorized a Number of Anomalies, or Exceptions, to the natural Rules of Pronunciation: And, as that is the *Jus et norma loquendi*, we must not rebel against such Authority. Perhaps no Reason, founded merely on the Nature of Sounds, can be given why the Monosyllable *Land* should be pronounced in less Time than the last Syllable

in the Word *command*. And yet it certainly is so. The Poets may call them both long, as they do; but to any Person who hath the least Ear, the Difference is so palpable as to render such an indiscriminate Use of Times in Poetry a little paradoxical. It is here to be observed, however, that in pronouncing the Words *land*, *band*, &c. we hasten the Articulation of the Voice; while, on the contrary, we evidently retard it in the last Syllable of *command* *.

The grammatical Reasons for sometimes shifting the Accent, on Words spelt alike, but of different Meaning, have sometimes a similar Effect, in causing us to shorten or prolong the Utterance of the same Sounds: Thus in *recor'd*, the Verb, and *re'cord*, the Noun, the last Syllable of the first is greatly prolonged, while, in the second, it is hurried out of the Mouth as fast as possible.

* In Fact, the long, or, as it is called, open Sound of the Vowels, hath the same Effect on a Syllable naturally long, as a Diphthong has on one naturally short. Thus *a*, in *always*, *almost*, &c. hath the Sound of *a* α ; *o*, in *afford*, hath the same Sound as *o* α , in *board*; *i*, in *mind* and *kind*, hath the same Sound as *a* γ , i. e. a double or repeated *i*.

And

And yet, notwithstanding this, we find, agreeable to what hath been already observed, that the Accent does not *lengthen* the short Syllable preceding; *i. e.* it does not make *re* or *rec*, *ree* or *reec*.

But setting aside those Exceptions, from which no general Rules can be free, I conceive the following may enable us to judge pretty accurately of the natural Length of Syllables, when neither accelerated or retarded in the Utterance, for grammatical, oratorical, or poetical Reasons.

i. The Vowels, when singly made use of, as Syllables, are long or short, in Proportion to their Difference of Tone, when pronounced without regard to Equality of Time. Thus *a*, being of an intermediate Tone to the other Vowels, is neutral, *i. e.* neither long nor short; *i*, being more acute, is comparatively short; and *o*, being more grave, in like Manner comparatively long. But as neither the Teeth or Lips close in the Articulation of the Vowels, they may all, when used separately, be indefinitely long or short; as, in Fact, their Articulation is ended only by ceasing the Expiration of the Breath.

2. Syl-

2. Syllables beginning or ending, or both beginning and ending, with a single Consonant, are, very strictly speaking, long or short, according to the Vowel with which the Consonant is joined. Thus *at*, *bat*, are neutral; *bet*, *bed*, short; *bit*, *bid*, still shorter. On the other Hand, *bot*, *god*, are long; and *but*, *bud*, still longer. The Difference, however, in the Length of articulate Voices, so simple as these, is so small, that it may be altogether neglected in Reading, without the least Inconveniency, especially as the Modes of lengthening Syllables, by the Combination of a greater Number of Letters, make it necessary to form a Scale of a different Order: For, though *bot*, *god*, *but*, *bud*, be longer than *bet*, *bed*, *bid*, *bit*, yet they are not so long as *bote*, *gode*, *bute*, *bude*. Again, though *bet*, *bed*, *bid*, *bit*, are short in Comparison with *bot*, *god*, *but*, *bud*, yet they are much more so in Comparison with others formed of shorter Vowels, as *bete*, *bede*, *bide*, *bite*, all which are, nevertheless, Monosyllables; and, though they bear something of a double Sound by their Retardation, are yet to be deemed simple articulate Voices, because

because they are pronounced with one Expiration of the Breath.

In the Formation therefore of a proper Scale, something less accurate as to Time, I lay it down as a Rule, that all those Syllables which begin or end, or begin and end with a single Consonant, are naturally *short*, or the shortest Kind of Syllables.

These are, accordingly, never to be made long by any Accent or Emphasis whatever.

3. Syllables that begin and end, or that begin or end with two mute Consonants, are neutral, *i. e.* neither long nor short; nor can they be lengthened by Accent. Thus *apt* cannot, by any Accent, be made long, unless the *a* be prolonged into a Diphthong, as *a^upt*, or the Assistance of an *e* final be brought in to make it *aped*.

4. Such Syllables as end with a Vowel are also neutral: These, however, may be rendered long by Accent. Thus *Variety*, *various*, &c.

5. Syllables that begin and end, or that begin or end with two liquid Consonants, or with the last Letter but one a Liquid†,

† It is true, that the different Tone of the Vowels have here a very sensible Effect: Thus, in the Syllables *ding*,

E

deng,

are naturally long, Instances of this have been given in the preceding Section.

6. Syllables that end with an *e* final, or an additional *e*, that hath no other Use than to lengthen the Sound. Such are, *made, fade, these, those, &c.* As to Words ending in *ble*, or *ple*, such as *tremble, people, &c.* they are pronounced of the same Length as if their final *e* was inserted between the two preceding Consonants, and are accordingly short Syllables.

7. Syllables containing genuine Diphthongs* (by which I mean those wherein the

deng, dang, dong, dung, the first, i. e. *ding*, must necessarily be pronounced the shortest, and the last, *dung*, the longest, if all are pronounced equally distinct.

Hence, the last Syllables of our active Participles, i. e. *ing*, is almost universally supposed to be short. It may be observed, however, that if this Rule be adhered to in Reading, the Reader will pronounce it as if it were written *in*. Thus, he would say, *hearin, gettin, lookin, &c.* But this is a vicious and indistinct Method of Pronunciation, and ought to be avoided; as by these Means, *hearing* may possibly be mistaken for *herein*, *looking* for *look in*, *getting* for *get in*; and yet this Mode of Pronunciation is taught in many of our Grammars. Mr. Mason says, that a Vowel before two Consonants is often short; but if he means in the same Syllable, and the two Consonants are pronounced, it is not true.

* That is, in Opposition to mere literal or nominal ones, such as are contained in Words, by almost universal

the Sounds of two Vowels are blended to form a Sound twice as long, or different from either; such are *read*, *mead*, *road*, *toad*, &c.) are always long.

With regard to the Exceptions against the above Rules, the arbitrary Disposition of Custom may have authorized many. I will venture to affirm, however, that if these Rules were well attended to, there are many Vices of Custom that might be remedied, to the great Improvement of Speaking and Reading.

It must be also observed here, that as there is a Difference of Length in the short Syllables, so there is a like Difference among the long. This arises, however, in an arbitrary Manner from the Circumstance of the Vowels having all a long, a

sal Custom, pronounced as if they were spelt with one Vowel only; such are, *head*, *dead*, *bread*, &c. As also in the common Termination of most of the Adjectives in Words derived from the Latin, *i. e.* in *ous*, which is almost always pronounced simply *us*. In like manner, in Words ending in *our* and *ion*, always pronounced *ur* and *shun*, the Duplicity of Sound in the Diphthong is entirely lost. Mr. Mason, indeed, tells us, that Diphthongs, in English, are often short. But he can only mean, that they are comparatively so by Position, or rendered so by Want of Significance in the Sentence, not that they are naturally so, if genuine Diphthongs.

short, or an open and a close Sound; in other Words, because the Length of their Articulation is indefinite. Hence it is that we found some Words spelt in the same Manner, and even the same Words, very variously. Thus the Words *ford* and *lord* are pronounced of unequal Length, tho' ending with the same Letters.

Again, some Persons say *wīnd* †, while others say *wīnd*; others *ēnd*, instead of *ēnd*. Nay, there are some, and those deemed polite Speakers too, who pronounce even Diphthongs short, as, *berd* for *beard*, *berd* for *beard*, *def* for *deaf*, &c.

In some Cases, grammatical Motives induce this Method of Pronunciation, as in the Verb *read*, whose present and past Tense, being spelt alike, the latter is pronounced as if was written *red*.

On the Whole, however, it appears, that these Modes are, for the most part, arbitrary, and are often merely local and transitory; so that they cannot easily be reduced to any regular System of Pronunciation. Add to this, that having ascertained the comparative Length of the shorter Syl-

† *Wind* is frequently a Rhime to *kind* and *mind* with our best Poets.

lables, agreeable to the shortest or close Sound of the Vowels, the Length of the *longer* must certainly be conformable to the same Standard. Thus the Syllable *wind*, whether pronounced short or long, in *polite Conversation*, is accounted long in the Measure of poetical Quantity. And the Words *hand* and *lord* are accounted long, in the same manner as the last Syllables in the Words *command* and *afford*, for the same Reasons.

That these Anomalies are purely arbitrary and irregular, also appears from hence, that it is not in the Power of Emphasis or Accent to make them in Articulation equally long, without a palpable Drawling or Retardation of the Voice, is very evident to such as have been accustomed to pronounce such Words shorter. On the other hand, Persons used to say *heard*, *beard*, *deaf*, conceive it a mighty finicking, mincing Method to say *herd*, *berd*, *def*, &c.

The Insignificancy of these Variations is, indeed, perceptible enough in some Instances, particularly in those last mentioned; it being a Matter of no very great Consequence to the Propriety and Energy

54 *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.*

of Speech, let them be pronounced either Way: But when we come to Modes of long and very general standing, as in the Pronunciation of the last Syllable in the Words *afford* and *command*, we should be supposed to break through all the Rules of Prosody, should we pronounce them as in the Words *Lord* and *Land* *.

Our very best Poets, nevertheless, make no Scruple of Rhiming with such Sounds; so that, from their Example, and for the Reasons above given, no prosodical Distinction is made between them.

VTI
SECT. IV. *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.*

In the Definition of Accent, some modern Writers have followed the Ancients, in pretending that it hath only to do with the Inflections, or the *high* and *low* Tone of the Voice; Others again confine it altogether to Time; while a third Party say, it consists *principally*, if not altoge-

* Hence the Distinction between true and false Diphthongs, Custom having in some Words rendered them merely typical; thus in *bread*, *dead*, &c. the Sound of the *a* is altogether suppressed in London, though not in some of the Provinces.

ther,

ther, in the Loudness or Softness of its Articulation.

The Rhetoricians, indeed, object to this last Assertion, pretending, that in this Case we confound *Accent* with *Quantity*. This, however, is not strictly true; but supposing it were, as it is generally agreed that *Accent* chiefly determines the *Quantity* of English Syllables, where is the Impropriety †? Certain it is, that a Syllable may be very forcibly accented, and preserve the very same Tone of every other unaccented Syllable in the Sentence.

If there be so great a Difference between the Prosody of the Ancients, and that of modern Languages, that it is confessedly in vain to think of introducing the Rules of the former into the latter, why must we strictly adhere to their Distinctions of *Accent* and *Quantity*, in direct Opposition to our own Ears, and the Dictates of common Sense?

† If *Quantity* be, as Mr. Johnson, Mr. Sheridan, and Others say, “the Measure of *Time* in pronouncing a Syllable,” and if that *Quantity* be chiefly determined (according to Lord Kaimes, Say, Mason, and Others) by the *Accent*, how can it be pretended, that *Accent* hath only to do either with the Acuteness or Gravity of the Tone, or with the Length, of a Syllable?

56 *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.*

I think it hath been made sufficiently clear in the preceding Sections, that English Syllables are naturally of different Lengths; and that their Length cannot, in many Cases, be altered by Accent.

It is admitted, indeed, that Accent hath a considerable Influence over their Length, when they are formed into Words and Syllables; it remains, therefore, to enquire what this Influence is, and how far it extends.

It hath been said, that “ Common Use
“ and Custom will never fail to determine
“ the Accent; the Sense of the Period
“ when understood, will always point out
“ the Emphasis; and where the Accent
“ or Emphasis is thus directed to fall,
“ that Syllable (be its natural Quantity
“ what it will) is, in that Place considered as long; and those Syllables that
“ have neither Accent or Emphasis, are
“ considered as short*”.

It

* Mason on the Power of Numbers, Page 11.—There is some Impropriety also in speaking of Emphasis and Accent as indiscriminately falling on *Syllables*, Emphasis respecting nothing less than *whole Words*, except in some very particular Cases, where the Emphasis and Accent
are

It might be asked here, however, what is meant by the Term *considered* short or long? Would the Writer persuade the Reader to pronounce them so?—I have already shewn in several Instances that he could not.

To give a Syllable, therefore, naturally and unalterably short, an equal Degree of Force with another naturally long, it must be pronounced proportionably louder. And thus it is that *Time* and *Force* reciprocally compensate each other in the Composition of English Quantities; even as in the Composition of Motion, the Matter and Velocity may reciprocally supply the Place of each other in forming the Momentum of the Whole, a small Quantity of Matter moving with a great Velocity, being equal to a greater Quantity moving proportionably slow.

It is just the same in the Quantities of English Syllables, and we might as well say, that the Velocity of a moving Body is not essential to its Motion, as that the na-

are placed on different Syllables of the same Word, to enforce the Antithesis of the Sense. Thus, *A Convérſion!*
no — it was a Pérvérſion. — He turned, yes, and returned.

tural

ral Length of Syllables is not essential to distinct Pronunciation.

Hence it is plain, that the same Quantity of Sound, or Force of Accent, may be laid upon a short Syllable as on a long one, and, *vice versa*, without prolonging the one, or contracting the other. And here we have the Reason why an accented short Syllable may, in *English* Verse, supply the Place of a long one unaccented, without Injury to the Rythmus, or Measure.

It was for Want of duly considering the Nature of this Subject, that Mr. Sheridan, while he severely censures the *palpable* and *gross* Mistakes of our Dictionary Makers in placing the Accent, falls into the most egregious Mistakes himself.

This Writer, after making a Distinction between the ancient and modern Accents, as far as regarded the Inflections, or musical Tones of the Voice, proceeds to inform us, that the Term Accent, in the English, means only a peculiar Manner of distinguishing one Syllable of a Word from the rest. This Distinction, says he, is made by us in two Ways; either by dwelling longer upon one Syllable than the rest, or by giving it a smarter Percussion
of

of the Voice in Utterance. So that *Accent* with us, continues he, is not referred to *Tune*, but to *Time*; to *Quantity*, not *Quality*.

“ It is by the Accent chiefly (says this
“ Author) that the Quantity † of our
“ Syllables is regulated ; but not accord-
“ ing to the mistaken Rule laid down by
“ all who have written on that Subject,
“ that the Accent always makes the Syl-
“ lables long, than which there cannot
“ be any Thing more false. For the two
“ Ways of distinguishing Syllables by Ac-
“ cent, as mentioned before, are directly
“ opposite, and produce quite contrary
“ Effects ; the one, by dwelling on the
“ Syllable, necessarily makes it long ; the
“ other, by the smart Percussion of the
“ Voice, as necessarily makes it short.
“ Thus the first Syllables in *glory, father,*
“ *holy*, are long, whilst those in *battle,*
“ *habit, borrow*, are short *.”

Mr. Sheridan is certainly right when he says, that the Accent does not relate to *Tune*, nor doth always make Syllables

† Meaning only the Time.

* See Sheridan's Lectures on Elocution, Lect. ii.

long ;

60 *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.*

long ; but when he affirms, that it relates solely to the *Time* or Length of our Syllables, he is greatly mistaken ; for, as I have shewn above, the *Quantity* of a Syllable in Pronunciation, is the whole Momentum of the Sound producing it, and not merely the Time of its Utterance.

I should be glad also to know the Effect of his second Method of accenting Syllables. Will the smart Percussion, he speaks of, render the Tone more acute, or only more loud ? If the former, it hath something to do with *Tune*. But the Truth is, that all accented Syllables, whether long or short, are pronounced fuller or louder than others. Supposing them, therefore, to be all accented equally, *i. e.* to be pronounced equally distinct and emphatical, the *long* will not be so loud as the *short*, their Force being inversely proportional to their Length. Their natural Length, however, would not, in this Case, be necessarily altered ; for they would not be *short*, because they were *loud* ; but *loud*, because they were *short*.

If the Syllables specified also be long and short in the Words he mentions, it is for the Reasons given in the preceding Section,

Section. The Syllables *glo, fa, ho*, in *glory, father, holy*, are naturally neutral; and, being accented, are long. Again, *bat, bab, bor*, in *battle, habit, borrow*, are, agreeable to the same Rules, naturally short, and cannot be lengthened by the Accent.

Mr. Sheridan, indeed, tells us, that
“ the Quantity (meaning the *Time*) de-
“ pends on the *Seat* of the Accent, whe-
“ ther it be on the Vowel or Consonant;
“ if, on the Vowel, the Syllable is ne-
“ cessarily long, as it makes the Vowel
“ long; if on the Consonant, it may be
“ either long or short, according to the
“ Nature of the Consonant, or the Time
“ taken up in dwelling upon it. If the
“ *Consonant* be in its *Nature* a *short* one,
“ the Syllable is necessarily short. If it
“ be a *long* one (that is, one whose Sound
“ is capable of being lengthened) it may
“ be long or short at the Will of the
“ Speaker †.”

Now,

† By a short Consonant, says Mr. Sheridan, I mean one whose Sound cannot be continued after a Vowel; such as *c*, or *k*, *p*, *t*, as *ac, ap, at*; whilst that of long Consonants can, as *el, em, en, er*, &c. Now, nothing is more certain

62 *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.*

Now, nothing can be more absurd than to suppose the Length of Syllables determined chiefly by the Accent, as if Sylla-

certain than, that the *latter* are *single articulate Voices* as well as the former: And if there be any Difference in their Length, on Account of the softer Ending of the Liquids, it is so little as not to be worth Notice. As to the *Continuation of the Sound of a Consonant after a Vowel*, I should be glad to know, whether it be contained in the Articulation of the Syllable, or continued indistinctly afterwards. If the *former*, the Sound of the *Vowel* must be lengthened, as Consonants, whether liquid or mute, have no other Sound than what they possess by virtue of their Union with some Vowel. If the *latter*, such a Continuation of indistinct Sound is a Vice in Pronunciation. We may, indeed, continue to *bifs* after an *r*, to *yell* after an *l*, to *lum* after an *m*, to *suarl* after an *r*, &c. But to adopt such Practices, and lay them down as Rules of Oratory and Profody, is somewhat extraordinary!

If Mr. Sheridan's long Consonants would make the preceding Vowel long, then, indeed, they might be said to lengthen the Syllable. *P* is a short Consonant, and *l* a long one; and yet, distinctly pronounced, *ap* and *al* are, to my Ears, equally long, or, as I before observed, very nearly so; whereas, if this supposed long Consonant were to lengthen the Syllable, *al* should certainly have the Sound of *all* or *ale*; *el* should sound long as *eel*, *em* as *sem*, *en* as *sen*, &c.

Again, Mr. Sheridan places *s* among his *short* Consonants, though its Sound may be continued almost indefinitely; and *m* among his *long* ones, though the Lips must be fairly closed in its Pronunciation, and its Sound, if continued, be necessarily forced through the Nose.

bles

bles had no natural Measure of their own, and at the same Time to conceive that single Consonants possessed such a natural Difference, and that so great, as to determine the Efficacy of the Accent on the whole Syllable. Since when is it that Consonants have had any Sound at all independent of the Vowels? The Seat of the Accent being fixed upon the last Letter of a Syllable, is also as great an Innovation; for *Accent* belongs not to *Letters* but *Syllables*, as *Emphasis* to *Words*, and *Tones* to *Sentences*.

If we change the Seat of the Accent in the above Instances, Mr. Sheridan says, we should change the Quantity of the Syllables. Thus, if we say *glór'y* for *glòry*, *fát'ber* for *fáther*, *hól'y* for *hóly*, the first Syllables would become short. As, on the other Hand, were we to dwell on the Vowels instead of the Consonants in the last Instances, they would change from short to long. As, for Instance, if instead of *battle* we should say *bàttle*, for *habít*, *bà bit*, and for *bórrrow*, *bò rrow*; and this, continues Mr. Sheridan, "is one of the
" chief Sources of the Difference between
" the *Scotch* and *English* Gentlemen in the
" Pro-

64 *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.*

“Pronunciation of English.” But what does all this prove? In Reality, nothing more than that those, who know not how to spell, or to divide English Words into Syllables, may be assisted by the Position of the *accentual Type* or *Mark* in Reading, but does by no Means prove that the Length of Syllables depends on the Position of that Mark; for, as to the Force of the Accent, it lies on the *whole Syllable*, and doth not *belong*, as this Writer affirms, to a particular Letter in such Syllable.

Indeed, a Reader must know very little of the Orthography, or Orthoepey, of any Language, who should divide the Words *battle* and *borrow* into Syllables thus, *bat-tle*, *bo-rrow*, which they must do to pronounce them as Mr. Sheridan supposes.

There are some Words, indeed, which Strangers, without knowing the Manner of accenting them, might divide thus mistakenly, and thence be induced to make those Syllables long, which are usually pronounced short, and *vice versa*. Thus in *habit*, which, without any manifest orthographical Impropriety, might be syllabified and pronounced by a Foreigner *há bit*, as well as *hab it*. But though the Seat of
the

the Accent may direct us in the proper Division of Words into Syllables, or articulate Voices, the Force of it does, by no Means, rest on particular Letters, nor can it be arbitrarily placed on them at random, without regard to the natural Method of dividing Words into Syllables, which depends on the Disposition of the Vowels and Consonants composing such Words; *e. g.* in *venture, center, random, handsome*, it is impossible, consistent with the Orthoëpy of any Language, to divide these Words into Syllables, so as, in Speaking, to separate the first Vowel from the succeeding Consonant. So that whether the Accent should be laid on the first Syllable, or the last, of these Words, they can never be divided into articulate Sounds, otherwise than thus, *ven-ture, cen-ter, ran-dom, hand-some*; or thus, *vent-ure, cent-er, rand-om, hands-ome*.

What Mr. Sheridan means by the *Seat* of the *Accent* may, indeed, be worth attending to, as the Position of that Mark, in Orthography, may serve to shew when the Vowel hath its long or *iterated* Sound, and when it hath its short or *single* one. Thus in *warmly, warlike, hardly, tardy,*
F *kindly,*

66 *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.*

kindly, mindful, &c. it might not be improper to set the accentual Mark on the Vowels in the first Syllable. On the other hand, in such Words as, *bandful, manly, kindle*, it might be proper to place it on the Consonant succeeding the Vowel.

But what hath all this to do with the Nature and Use of Accent in general? Will any one pretend that the first Syllables in *bandful, manful, kindle*, are not equally accented with the first Syllables in *warmly, warlike, hardly, kindly, mindful, &c.*

It is further observed, by this Writer, that “no Vowel hath a long Sound in an “unaccented Syllable:” From which he concludes, that if this Article of Accent were properly adjusted, it would prove a Master-Key to the Pronunciation of our whole Tongue.

Now, I am of Opinion that the Master-Key to Pronunciation is the Knowledge of the natural Length of articulate Sounds, conceiving that, if Mr. Sheridan had examined this Affair to the Bottom, he would have found that the Seat of the Accent depends more frequently on the Length of the Syllables, than the Length of Syllables on the Accent.

Instead

Instead of saying, therefore, that no Vowel ever has a long Sound in an unaccented Syllable; he might, with equal Propriety, have said, every Syllable, in which the Vowel hath a long Sound, is accented. But the Fact is, that neither the one nor the other is true, as may be proved in numerous Instances *.

I shall mention only a few, in Words both of two and three Syllables, where the Accent lies on the first Syllable, and none on the second or last, wherein the Vowel, nevertheless, preserves its long Sound: Such are *contrite, deluge, empire, exile, finite, female, fortune, gangrene, prostrate, attribute, authorize, concubine, dissipate, servitude, &c.* Will it be said that Words ending with an *e* final must not be considered as comprehended in this Rule, because that this Vowel, though in itself mute, always makes a Syllable long? I answer, that though it frequently makes Syllables long, it does not always so †;

* And yet Mr. Sheridan lays it down as an *infallible* and *invariable* Rule. See his Lectures.

† Witnesses are, *were, famine, engine, motive, justice,* and many others, in which the *e* final, though annexed in *Writing*, is totally mute in *Speaking*.

68 *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.*

and yet, though it does not necessarily give the preceding Vowel its long Sound †, there are Syllables which it nevertheless makes long, though unaccented : And these form such a Number of *Exceptions*, as, to a pretended *infallible* and *invariable* Rule, amounts to a Contradiction of the Rule itself.

But Mr. Sheridan goes still farther, and says, whenever the Accent is on the Consonant (that is, generally when the Consonant ends the Syllable) the Sound, not only of the preceding Vowel, is always shortened, but no other Vowel in the Word has ever its full long Sound. I have instanced the contrary, however, in the Words *contrite*, *deluge*, *empire*, *exile*, &c. To which may be added numerous other Examples, in which the *e* final is not concerned ; such are *echo*, *arrow*, *cargo*, *ensign*, *compound*, &c. Would Mr. Sheridan have these Words pronounced *cóntřit*, *délüdg*, *em'pír*, *ex'íl*, *ec'hö*, *ar'ro*, *cárgö*, *en'sín*, *cómpüñd*?

If this Improver of the English Language, indeed, had pretended to take the

† Thus in *challenge*, *entrance*, *incense*, &c. the Vowels in the last Syllable (though naturally long, as having the *e* mute annexed) have not the long Sound of the Vowel.

Sound.

Sound of our Words from the cursory and colloquial Pronunciation of the Unlearned, he might have laid down such Rules with some Kind of Propriety *, as, in common Conversation, the long and short Sound of the Vowels are frequently thus confounded. Hence, People may sometimes say *em'pīr* for *em'pīre*, *en'sin* for *en'sign*; but then no Difference is made between the long Sound of the *i* in that Word, and the short one in *engine*, *famine*, &c.

The colloquial Pronunciation of our Language, however, as Mr. Johnson very justly observes, is always vague and uncertain, being made different in different Mouths by Negligence, Unskilfulness, or Affectation,

* As to the Word *compound*, however, it is hardly in the Power of the most precipitate Speaker to shorten it, even in Conversation. There are also many other Words of the same Kind in our Language, which contradict the general Rule, that but one Accent is placed on Words of two Syllables; such are *convoy*, *consort*, *concourse*, *discord*, *falsehood*, *farthing*, *furlong*, *hemlock*, *impulse*, *inquest*, *instinct*, *linguist*, *offspring*, *shipwreck*. To these, we may add almost all the other Words compounded of two Monosyllables; as *earthquake*, *quicksand*, *sackcloth*, *lukewarm*, *hailstone*, &c.

The Cause of Mr. Sheridan's Mistake in these Particulars, appears to be his falling into a fundamental Error respecting the *Nature* of English *Accent*, by conceiving it to be the same Thing with the ancient Quantity or *Time*. I shall endeavour to set this important Article, therefore, in a true Light : To which End I shall apply rather to the mechanical Theory of Speech, as founded on actual Observation, and the Principles and Experiments of natural Philosophy, than to the Practices of the Ancients, or Opinions of classical Authority.

The Intent and Use of emphasizing and accenting particular Words and Syllables in a Sentence, are evidently to render them more distinct, or to convey them more forcibly to the Ear, in order to present their Meaning in a stronger Light to the Understanding, as more important and significant than that of the rest.

Now, there are two Circumstances absolutely essential to the Purposes of Speech, and therefore more particularly so to every Word that is accented. 1st. That it should be heard. 2d. That it should be heard articulately.

With

With regard to the *first*, or the *Audibility* of Speech, it can be increased or diminished only by increasing or diminishing the *Force* of it.

From the Neglect of Writers on this Subject, to make a proper Distinction between the *Tone* and *Force* of the Voice, it is not very unreasonable to infer, that they were ignorant of it, or at least of its great Importance to Pronunciation. It is well known, however, to Persons ever so little acquainted with experimental Philosophy, that a Sound may pass through various Degrees of *loud* and *soft*, without altering its *Tone*.

It is certain, that whether a Monochord be struck violently or gently, its Vibrations being isochronal, the *Tone* of its Sound must be constantly the same, though it will be loudest when first struck, and gradually decrease, in Loudness, at every Vibration, till its Sound totally dies away.

It is true, indeed, that a shrill or acute Sound is generally more audible, or better heard, and at a greater Distance, than a grave one; but this is, because the acute Sounds are commonly sounded louder in

72 *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.*

Proportion than grave ones : The Reason of which is, that the Effort, or Stroke, which may be sufficient to stretch an *acute*-sounding Chord to its utmost Extent, will be able to stretch a *grave*-sounding one to but a *small Part* of that Extent. As the Loudness of a Tone, therefore, depends on the Extent * to which the Chord is stretched, it is plain, that the same Effort to speak in a high Tone will have a greater Effect than if made in a low one.

Hence arises the common Error of supposing acute Tones naturally louder than grave ones ; whereas, the highest Note of a Harpsichord may be so struck as scarcely to be heard, and the lowest so as to make the whole House resound.

It is plain from hence, that if Accent had only to do with *high* and *low*, as some pretend †, the accented Syllables in a Word or Sentence might be pronounced with Propriety, and yet in such a Man-

* That is in Proportion to its *Length*; the Stroke that will sometimes cause a *short* String to vibrate several Times, and yield a long Note, being incapable of moving a *long* one with sufficient Velocity to make any Sound at all.

† See Chambers's Dictionary, under the Words *Accent*, and *Tone*.

ner as not to be heard, while all the rest might be distinctly audible. What Work this would make in Speaking or Reading English, or how far it agrees with our Notions of Accent, I leave every Englishman to judge. These Considerations induce me to conclude, that Accent in English, is so far from having only to do with *high* and *low*, that, strictly speaking, it hath nothing to do with high and low at all.

We shall examine next how far the Audibility of Sound hath to do with *Time*.

Nothing is more certain, than that we can neither hear, see, or feel any Thing whose Presence or Effect is instantaneous ; it is necessary that every Object describe a certain Quantity of Space or Time before it can possibly be perceived.

Now, in acute Tones, the Vibrations of the Air being quicker than in grave ones, it is certain, that the *acute* Tone will sooner constitute any determinate Momentum of Sound than the *grave* one. As it is plain, however, that the grave one, in *due Time*, would constitute the like Momentum, it is evident that Time and Tone, as before observed, may reciprocally compensate, or supply the Place of each other in the Formation

74 *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.*

mation of Accent, which is, for the same Reasons, a most palpable Compound of both. And thus the shortest Syllables may be accented as strongly as the longest, and the longest as feebly as the shortest; that is, within the *Bounds of Articulation*: For it is to be observed, that very strong or *loud* Sounds, as well as very weak or soft Sounds, are equally inarticulate: Thus, in conversing through a *Speaking Trumpet*, the louder the Voice is, the more inarticulate it grows.

We come now to consider, therefore, *secondly*, the distinct *Articulation* of Speech.

And here it is first to be observed, that as the *Audibility* of Speech doth not depend merely on the *Tone* of Voice, so its *Articulation* depends as little on its Force: For a very *weak* or *low* Voice (though not so audible, or to be heard at so great a Distance) may be equally articulate with the strongest or loudest Voice, the Extremes of both being *grumbling* or *whispering*, and *roaring* or *hooting*.

As accented Syllables, therefore, are required not only to be *audible*, as mere Sounds, but also to be distinctly so, as *articulate* Voices, the Preservation of a due
 Tenor

Tenor * or Medium of Voice in Speaking or Reading, is absolutely essential to a good Pronunciation. Hence it is, that when Persons speak louder † than ordinary, they have not the same Command of Voice, nor speak so distinctly and intelligibly as when they speak more softly. It is proper, therefore, for such as would speak articulately, to avoid both the *mincing* and *mouthing* Mode of Pronunciation, particularly in their Utterance of accented Syllables, or emphatical Words.

As to the farther Use of the *Accent* in combining Syllables into Words, so much insisted on by Mr. Sheridan, I shall shew the Futility of it at large in the next Section.

* Not a musical Tenor or Medium between high and low Tones, but a Medium between the *loud* and the *soft*; of which every Person must form a Judgment from the usual Distance at which he is heard, and the Effort he usually makes without straining the Organs.

† By louder, also, is not meant in a higher Tone, but with greater Force or Energy.

SECT. VIII. *Of the Seat of the Accent, and its pretended Use in the Formation of Words.*

The Use of Accent, in our Language, says Mr. Sheridan, is not confined to Quantity alone; but it is also the chief Mark by which Words are distinguished from Syllables. Or rather, says he, it is the very *Effence* of *Words*, which, without that, would be only so many Collections of Syllables: Monosyllables being, according to this Writer, mere articulate Sounds, unless they are accented. It is true, he admits that this Manner of distinguishing Words from mere Syllables, is not necessary, nor the only Way by which it can be done. He prefers it, nevertheless, to the natural Method of making a perceptible Pause between each Word, agreeable to the Practice of all modern Nations. If he had duly considered this Matter, however, I conceive he would have found it impossible to speak or read distinctly, without making some little Pause between every Word *. It is well

* This Pause may be indefinitely short, provided it be sufficient to distinguish the Ending of the Words from the
Ending

worth the Pains to enquire, continues this Writer, which of these Methods are the best, “ as it may turn our Attention to a
“ Point hitherto little considered, and yet
“ which is one of the greatest Perfections
“ of which our Language has to boast.”

Now nothing is more certain, than that this supposed Perfection is altogether chimerical. He tells us, indeed, that there cannot be a more evident or precise Distinction than this of Accent, nor one which can be executed with more Ease and Certainty: It requires no Nicety of Ear, as in the distinguishing of Tones, or measuring of *Time*; it only demands that one Syllable should have greater Stress laid on it than others †: For “ if any one
“ places *two equal Accents* on the same
“ Word, it sounds to our Ear like two
“ Words.”

Now, for aught that appears in Mr. Sheridan's Lectures, it is possible to ac-

Ending of the Syllables; so that it need not be productive of that disgusting Tedioufness this Writer supposes.

† Is this altogether consistent with Mr. Sheridan's referring it to *Time*, and not to *Tune*? Or with his two-fold Method of accenting Syllables, one of which consists in dwelling longer upon one Syllable than the rest?

cent a Syllable *equally* in either of his Modes; for if a Syllable be *dwelt upon* proportionably long, it will be accented as strongly as if he had laid a quick Strefs on it, by what he calls his *sharp Percussion*. Be this, however, as it will, I may venture safely and boldly to deny, that “we always hear as many Words as “we hear Accents, or that English “Words, properly pronounced, have no “more than *one* Accent.”

The Advocates for this Scheme may fickle, indeed, for the *Inequality* of the *Accent* placed on two different Syllables of the same Word *; but I will appeal to every

* Mr. Sheridan admitting that the longer Polysyllables have two Accents, the one, however, so much weaker than the other, as to shew that the Syllables are all included in one Word. As a Proof of this, he quotes the single Word *expo'stulatory*. But what will he say to the Words *ac'cident*, *mónument*, *artific'e*, *abrogáte*, and a Thousand others. Will it be said, that the strongest Accent lies on the first Syllable? Let us then add a Syllable to each, and say *ac'cidental*, *monumen'tal*, *artific'ial*, *abrogá-tion*: The Accent now becomes stronger on the third Syllable; but can it be consistent with a proper Method of Pronunciation to sink the first so much as to confirm the Rule in Question? The Absurdity of this Notion will appear farther, if we reflect on the principal Use of Accent and Emphasis, which is to enforce the most significant Syllables

every Person that hath an Ear, whether such Difference will justify this Writer's laying down such a Proposition as a fundamental Rule, upon which the very Essence of our Words depends, and which is so universal, that there is not a single Exception to it in our whole Language, when the Words are properly pronounced.

How would Mr. Sheridan, for Instance, pronounce the Words following? *Acquiesce, appertain, cavalcade, circumvent, condescend, disallow, immature, magazine, masquerade, reconcile.* These, and many other Words, are set down in our Vocabularies, as being accented on the *last* Syllable. Again, others are set down as accented on the *first* Syllable; such are *architect, aqueduct, beautify, circumspect, enterprize, interview, intimate, intercourse, manifold, manuscript, orthodox, retrogade, &c.*

It is very evident, however, on a bare Repetition of these Words, that they

lables and Words. Now to make one Accent in Polysyllables, like Aaron's Serpent, swallow up the rest, is to defeat the first and principal End of all Energy in Pronunciation. See this Matter farther explained in the Text.

might

might change Lifts *, or, with the same Propriety, be put into one. They are all, indeed, equally accented both on the first and the last, and very justly so; for, if the End of Emphasis and Accent be to convey the most significant Parts of Sentences and Words forcibly and distinctly to the Ear, no Reason can be given why the first and last Syllables in these Words should not be equally accented.

Nothing, indeed, can be more destructive of the principal End and Institution of Accent and Emphasis, than the Practice of huddling the significant Syllables of a Word together, in order to lay a single Accent on one, perhaps the most insignificant of the Whole. Yet nothing is more frequent than this vicious Practice, which Mr. Sheridan's Rules naturally tend to promote. Thus, in forming Derivatives of four Syllables from Words of three, the Stress of the Accent is generally encreased upon the third, (as that Writer recommends) and diminished on the first. By this Me-

* Indeed they frequently do so, as may be seen by comparing any two of our Nomenclatures, Grammars, or Spelling Books.

thod, however, the Meaning of the Word is totally obscured : Thus from *cavalcade* and *masquerade*, should we form *cavalcading*, *masquerading*, and pronounce them after this erroneous Manner, the significant Parts of the Word would be hurried over, to swell the Sound of a mere expletive or *formal* Syllable, common to all Words so modified, as is the Case in Words ending in *ation*; thus *exclamation*, *fermentation*, *visitation*, *naturalization*.

Is it not contrary to the very Purposes of Speech, and even to common Sense, to pretend, that the Sounds of the first Syllables of these Words, on which their Meaning solely depends, should be weaker than the formal *ma*, *ta*, *za*, which are common to a thousand Words of different Meanings?

It is really amazing to see how a Number of ingenious Men can successively skim over a Subject, without ever once dipping beyond the Surface, or really enquiring into that Propriety to which they make such pompous Pretensions. We laugh, as the Satirist observes, at a Parcel of Sheep when they precipitately follow each other,

G

for

for no other Reason than that the Bell-Weather took the Leap before them: And yet the greater Part of our pretended Improvements in Literature are little else than a careless Repetition of what others have said as carelessly before us.

SECT. IX. *Of the Number, Diversity, and proper Use of Accents.*

To set this Affair of Accent in a true Light, it will be necessary to throw aside entirely the Ideas usually annexed to the Term by those who have treated of the learned Languages, and to consider it simply, as we experience its Effects in the English.

It is from a due Observance of these Effects, that I will venture to lay down the following Rules, the Truth of which (however contrary to common Opinion) I hope sufficiently to illustrate by Examples.

- 1st. That *Accent*, in English, is neither the Tone of an articulate Voice, nor simply the Time taken up in the Utterance of it; nor merely the Force or Loud-

- Loudness of such Voice ; but the whole Momentum or Quantity of Sound emitted to produce it.
2. That Syllables being accented as variously as the Measures of their Length and Force can be combined, and the Measures of Syllables being considered as *long*, *neutral* and *short*, there are two capital Distinctions in the Mode of accenting Syllables, viz. the *loud* and the *soft* : The *former* belonging to *short* Syllables, the *latter* to *long* ones.
 3. That Words of more than one Syllable are not confined to a single Accent ; nor Words of any Number of Syllables to a *ruling* one ; even those of two Syllables having frequently *two equal* Accents ; the one *loud* and *short*, the other *soft* and *long*.
 4. That hence Syllables may be *equally* accented, though one of them be pronounced *softly*, and the other *loud*, provided the former be proportionably longer in Utterance than the latter.
 5. That the Accent placed on Dissyllables is always greatest ; and that it grows weaker in Proportion as the Number of accented Syllables in a Word encrease.

6. That the Accent is not of general Use in connecting Syllables into Words, however useful it may be in dividing Words into Syllables.

With regard to the first of these Propositions, I presume it is sufficiently proved by what hath already been advanced in the preceding Sections.

As to the *second*, it is but a Corollary of the first; for the Momenta of two Voices may be *equal*, though different in Length or Loudness, as Voices may have *different* Momenta, though equal in either Length or Loudness; articulate Sounds equally loud, not being equally accented, unless equally long. Hence arises that Duplicity in the Mode of accenting long and short Syllables; so that there is no Necessity, as Mr. Sheridan supposes, either for uttering polysyllable Words in so uniform a Manner as to resemble a regular Succession of Monosyllables, nor of huddling three or four indistinctly together, in order to lay a great Stress merely upon one.

I confess that two Syllables, the one immediately following the other, and both accented equally and *exactly alike*, would

very

very much resemble two Words. It is frequently necessary, however, that compound Words should be so pronounced; and yet the natural Pause we always make between separate Words, both in Speaking and Reading, is sufficient to mark the Difference between distinct Words and such Syllables. Thus *shipwreck*, *whirlwind*, &c. are easily distinguished as single Words; and yet, if pronounced according to Mr. Sheridan's Rule of allowing but one Accent to a Word, not only the Meaning of the Words would be obscured, but the Ear offended, by the false Pronunciation: For it is certain that the Syllables *wreck* and *wind*, are as significant, and also naturally as long, as *ship* and *whirl*; and yet we frequently hear the Accent laid, in common Conversation, on the first Syllables only, while the latter are hurried indistinctly off the Tongue, as if they were totally insignificant.

Again, there are many Words of two Syllables, on both of which an equal Accent ought to be laid, if we take in their naturally Difference of Time, e. g. *compound*, *convoy*, *colleague*, *consort*, *concourse*,

exile, empire, instinct, linguist, and many others.

Mr. Sheridan takes upon him to censure most of our public Speakers, and particularly those of the Stage, for pronouncing Words of this Kind with two equal Accents. It is not easy, however, to know what HE means by the Equality of Accent; his Notion of Accent itself being so confused and indistinct. Thus, according to him, it consists sometimes merely in the *Length*, or what he calls the *Quantity*, of a Syllable, and at others in the Strefs laid on the Voice in Articulation.

For my Part, I conceive, as before observed, that the Accent is compounded of both the *Length* and the Strefs of the Voice, and that Syllables may be accented equally, though in a different Manner: In which Case, two equal Accents may succeed each other, without any Impropriety of Sound, if diversified in their Modes of *loud* and *soft*. Thus in the Words *collègue, con'cours, exile, futile, &c.* let us place the *sharp* or *loud* Accent, marked thus', on the first Syllable, and the *flat* or *soft* Accent, marked thus', on the
the

the last Syllable, and the Method of pronouncing them will be properly indicated : Whereas,

If the last Syllable be left unaccented, and therefore be shortened in the Pronunciation into *collèg*, *concürs*, *éxil*, *fútil*, we should destroy all Beauty and Propriety of Articulation, the first Property of Speech *.

The Method of Pronunciation here recommended, is, indeed, objected to by some, as pedantic and formal, and therefore they teach Persons to pronounce all Words just as they are hurried over in common Conversation. There is a very wide Difference, however, between Formality and Slovenliness ; between a starched and

* As by so doing, we should fall into the Vice of what Mr. Sheridan calls the *Cockney* Pronunciation, and for which he so severely censures the London Citizens, whom he charges with pronouncing the Words *bellow*, *hollow*, *follow*, *window*, &c. thus *bèllèr*, *hòllèr*, *fòllèr*, *wìndèr* ; but if we strenuously insist on having but one exclusive Accent in a Word, I don't know how those Words can be pronounced otherwise ; their true Pronunciation being *bèllò*, *bòllò*, *fòllò*, *wìndò*. With what Propriety Mr. Sheridan can blame the *Cockneys* for saying *bèllèr* and *fòllèr*, and censure the *Players* equally for not saying *fórtùn*, *ná-túr*, *báttlèment*, instead of *fórtùne*, *nátùre*, *báttlèment*, I leave the Reader to judge.

pedantic Mode of Pronunciation, which affects to give every Syllable and Letter indiscriminately its full Sound, and that distinct and emphatical Mode which gives to articulate Voices their due Proportion of Sound, agreeable to their Significance and natural Construction. It is farther to be observed, that the colloquial Abbreviations and Contractions, which are by some made of so much Consequence, are very easily attained by those who are once Masters of the just or rhetorical Mode of Speaking: Whereas, such as are only versed in the colloquial Methods of Pronunciation, are strangely at a Loss when they come to read aloud, or to speak in public.

The Difference between the *colloquial* and the solemn Modes of Pronunciation, is much greater in some other Languages than our own. In reading French Poetry, it is the Custom to pronounce every Word and Syllable extremely distinct; so that an illiterate Parisian, or one who could not read, and therefore knew only the common colloquial Pronunciation of the French Tongue, could not possibly understand any Thing of what was so read.

The

The fourth Proposition is sufficiently illustrated by the Remarks already made.

In regard to the fifth, *viz.* “ That the
“ Accent placed on Diffyllables is always
“ greatest, and that it grows weaker in
“ Proportion as the Number of Syllables
“ in a Word increase ;”

It will be necessary to observe, that *Accent*, properly speaking, and considered as distinct from *Emphasis*, hath nothing to do with *Monosyllables*. Mr. Sheridan, indeed, says, that all the *Monosyllables*, which can properly be called Words, are accented. He admits, however, that they obtain their Accent, and become Words, only by being *emphatical*. But unless they constitute, or form Part of a Sentence, they cannot be *emphatical* : Whereas *Poly*syllables, or Words of more than one Syllable, bear an Accent whether they form a Part of a Sentence or no ; *i. e.* whether they have any *Emphasis* or not. Besides, Mr. Sheridan, in distinguishing *Accent* from *Emphasis*, defines the former as
“ the Link which ties Syllables together,
“ and forms them into Words.” A Definition that certainly confines mere *Accent* to Words of more than one Syllable.

Admit-

Admitting, however, that, with regard to Monosyllables, Accent and Emphasis are the same Thing, the Rule will still hold, and the Strefs laid on the accented Words of one Syllable is the greatest; on those of two Syllables the next; and so on to Polysyllables of any Number.

By the way it is to be observed, that when I say the Strefs will be the *greatest*, I mean, that accented Syllables in Words of the fewest Syllables will be sounded so much louder or longer in Proportion to the unaccented Syllables in the same Words. Thus in *anger, beaver, booty, cully, darkly, dwindle, &c.* the Difference between the accented and unaccented Syllables is greater than in the Words *ambuscade, appertain, cavalcade, intercept, entertain, repartee, &c.* The like Difference is still less in the last Words than in the following, *assassinate, commemorate, contaminate, exemplify, impertinent, &c.* And again still less in these than in the following, *asseveration, aristocratical, commemoration, excommunication, discontinuation, ecclesiastical, recapitulation, transubstantiation, &c.* It is evidently impossible to pronounce any of the latter Words tolerably distinct, with-

without laying almost as much Strefs on the unaccented Syllables, as on those which are accented. It must be also quite unnecessary to insist farther on the Absurdity of thinking to link such a Number of Syllables intelligibly together by one leading Accent; for when the Difference between the accented and unaccented Syllables is so little, that, between the ruling Accent and the inferior ones, must be altogether inadequate to the Purposes intended.

And yet Lord Kaims is of the same Opinion in this respect with Mr. Sheridan; laying it down as a general Observation, that a Word of *whatever Number* of Syllables, is not accented upon more than one of them. “Nor is this Practice, says his Lordship, merely arbitrary: The Object represented by the Word, being set in its best Light by a single Accent: Reiterated Accents on different Syllables in Succession make not the Emphasis stronger, but have an Air, as if the Sound only of the accented Syllables were regarded, and not the Sense of the Word.”

For my Part, I do not understand what this ingenious Critic means by giving a Word

Word *an Air, as if, &c.* but this is very certain, that if the longer Polysyllables above-mentioned were pronounced with only one Accent, the *Sense of the Word* would be totally disregarded, as the Accent, when they are hurried over in common Discourse, is always laid on the most insignificant Syllable in the whole Word : Thus in *excommunication, discontinuation, reconciliation, &c.* the Accent, if single, would be laid on the *ca* and *a*; in *immortality, infallibility, &c.* on the *il*; and in *circumlocution, circumvolution, &c.* on the *cu* and *lu*.

Is it possible that by such a Method of Accentuation, the Object of Words can be set in the best Light, or the Sense of them be most regarded ?

If it be ridiculous, as his Lordship observes, “ to put an Emphasis on a Word “ that of itself has no Meaning, and, “ like Cement, serves only to unite Words “ significant,” the same Rule is equally applicable to the Syllables forming Words, some of which are significant, and others in a great Degree merely formal.

With regard to the *sixth* Proposition, concerning the pretended Use of Accent
in

in linking the Syllables of Words together : Nothing can be more chimerical, nor has it the least Foundation in Practice, except in the Pronunciation of such Poly-syllables, as may, without any great Impropriety, be accented differently, *i. e.* with either a *flat* or a *sharp* Accent.

“ If I pronounce the Word *ar-ti-cu-lar-tion*, says Mr. Sheridan, as it is thus
“ divided into Syllables, without distinguishing any Syllable from the rest, it
“ is no longer a Word, but a Succession
“ of Syllables ; but when I pronounce it
“ *articulation*, laying an Accent on the
“ Syllable *lá*, that it is which constitutes
“ a Word, by uniting the preceding Syllables, and the subsequent one, to itself.”

This Matter appears, however, in a very different and a very extraordinary Light to me, who cannot conceive that the Strefs laid on a formal and unmeaning Part of a Word, should constitute the *Essence* of it.

It is, indeed, far from being true that it does so, it being impossible to pronounce this Word *articulation* INTELLIGIBLY, without laying an Emphasis on the

the first or second Syllable, and that as great a one (tho' not of the same Kind†) as that which is usually laid on the fourth. Add to this, that if we divide the Word agreeable to our Pronunciation of it, the articulate Voices, of which it consists, are different from the Syllables into which Mr. Sheridan hath divided it. Thus, supposing the Accent laid on the first Syllable, we should say *ar't-i-cu-là-tion*; if on the second, *ar-tíc-u-là-tion*; but we never say, *ar-ti-cu-la-tion*: For, in order to render any derivative Word (as Polysyllables mostly are) intelligible, it is absolutely necessary to lay one Accent on some Part of the radical Term: Whereas, if there be but one Accent laid on the whole, and that on the Syllable *là*, the radical Word *article* would be entirely sunk in the Pronunciation.

That, in the Case of a single Accent, it is necessary to huddle the other Syllables indistinctly together, to lay the Stress on that single Syllable, is very certain; and so far the unaccented Syllables of a Word may be said to be joined together by the

† The former being a quick or sharp one, and the other a slow or flat one.

Accent ; but instead of being *linked* together, they are compressed or forced one upon another ; for the Accent on *la* is so far from uniting the preceding Syllables of the Word to those which follow it, that it absolutely divides them.

In like Manner in the Words *ac'ciden'tal*, *con'trover'sial*, *málefac'tor*, *cir'cumscrib-ing*, *dómineèring*, &c. there is no Way in the World to distinguish them severally from two distinct Words in Pronunciation, except by the Difference of Pause in the Middle, and at the End of such Words.

This pretended linking Quality in the Accent, may seem to take place in such compound Words as *orthógraphy*, *geógraphy*, &c. but this is an adventitious Effect of the Seat of the Accent, which is owing to orthographical Motives, which are foreign to the present Purpose.

Were we to divide our Word into Syllables, agreeable to the Rules of Orthoëpy, instead of Orthography, the Accent might assist us in such Division. And, indeed, if we consider only the Pronunciation of Words, *i. e.* as they are compounded of distinct articulate Voices, nothing can be more absurd than the inconsistent Method
of

of the Grammarians, in dividing Words into Syllables one way, and directing their Pronunciation, as Compounds of particular Voices, in another. Thus we are taught to *pronounce* the following Words, as in the *first* Column, and to divide them into Syllables, in Spelling, as in the *second*.

1st. <i>As pronounced.</i>	2d. <i>As spelt.</i>
Am-i-ty	A-mi-ty
ded-i-cate	de-di-cate
em-i-nent	e-mi-nent
hom-i-cide	ho-mi-cide
nav-i-gate	na-vi-gate
neg-a-tive	ne-ga-tive
mat-ri-mon-y	ma-fri-mo-ny
or-thog-ra-phy	or-tho-gra-phy
rec-om-pence	re-com-pence
an-a-gram	a-na-gram
ap-of-tro-phe	a-po-stro-phe
ap-oth-e-ca-ry	a-po-the-ca-ry
an-im-ol-i-ty	a-ni-mo-fi-ty
ar-if-toc-ra-cy	a-ri-sto-cra-cy
ge-om-e-try	ge-o-me-try
mad-ri-gal	ma-dri-gal
mag-a-zine	ma-ga-zine
om-i-nous	o-mi-nous

Now

Now I will leave it to the Judgment of the Reader to determine whether a Foreigner, or any other, who might only know the Sound of the Letters, would not sooner learn to pronounce the above Words, by seeing them divided into articulate Voices, according to their real Pronunciation, than by puzzling himself with the numerous and very exceptionable Rules that have been invented to reconcile this false Method of dividing Words to their Pronunciation, by Means of Accent.

If Syllables be articulate Voices, as Grammarians define them, why are not Words divided into Syllables, agreeable to their real Articulation *?

It
* If the Grammarians have other Reasons for thus dividing Words, they should not have given such a Definition of a Syllable; for if a Syllable be, as they say, those compleat and distinct Sounds which unite in the Formation of Words, almost all the Rules they lay down for dividing Words into Syllables, are false. Thus they say, "when a single Consonant comes between two Vowels, it goes with the last Vowel in dividing a Word into Syllables." Is this true, however, in *agony*, *aliment*, *amity*, *capital*, *dragon*, *element*, *epicure*, *final*, *habit*, *benefit*, *model*, and a Thousand others of the like Nature? And yet Grammarians usually only except the

It is the making this absurd Distinction between written Syllables and articulate Sounds, that hath caused such intolerable Confusion in Writing and Speaking English.

I presume it sufficiently clear, therefore, from what hath been advanced, that Mr. Sheridan's Scheme for removing this Confusion, by Means of Accents, is rather calculated to increase it †. It is

this Letter *x* from this Rule, tho' the softest Consonant in the Alphabet is as exempt from it as the hardest. Thus *c* in *incit*, and *s* in *visit*, are as firmly attached to the preceding Vowel, as the *x* in *exalt*, *exist*, &c.

† Lord Kaims and Mr. Sheridan conceive, that the just Pronunciation of written Language cannot be easily pointed out to the Reader, without a Diversity of Typographical Marks; whereas I shall endeavour, in the proper Place, to shew, that, with the Help of a few general Rules for Pronunciation, and the simple Use of the Marks serving to point out the *grave* and *acute* Sounds among the Ancients, the just Pronunciation of all the Words in our Language may be known at Sight. With regard to the Effects of *Emphasis*, indeed, this is another Matter, respecting the Pronunciation of whole Sentences; and depending entirely on the Sense and Meaning of the Writer. So that, in short and easily intelligible Sentences, no Marks of any Kind would be necessary to point out the emphatical Words, which would be obvious at first Sight. And in more nice and difficult Passages, those Words might be rendered so, by printing them in different Types; for which

this Consideration which first induced me to think of, composing a RHETORICAL GRAMMAR of the *English Language*, on a very different Plan, in which I doubt not of reconciling the Orthography and Orthoëpy of our Tongue in a more satisfactory Manner than hath hitherto been attempted *.

SECT. X. *Of the Power and Use of Accent in the Quantity of Verse.*

Having considered the Nature of articulate Sounds and Syllables in general, we come next to consider them as they enter

which End those in Use, the *Roman*, *Italic*, and *Capital* small and great, are fully sufficient. In Confirmation of this, the Reader may turn to the new Edition of *Milton's Paradise Lost*, published for the Use of Schools; where he will find the emphatical Words thus distinguished. In that Work would have been introduced also, the Author's Method of *Accentuation*, had he not been fearful it would have been too great a Deviation from the common Plan of Printing, to be well received, without some previous Observations on its Expediency and Use; both which will be further illustrated and explained at large in a future Work.

* This Work is in great Forwardness, and will be published with all convenient Speed.

into the Composition of prosodiocal Quantity.

Most Writers, on the Prosody of our Language, have deduced their Rules from the Latin and Greek. It must appear something ludicrous, however, if not ridiculous, to People divested of classical Prejudices, to think that the Prosody of a living Language should be formed upon that of a dead one.

With regard to a living Language, a Man hath nothing to do but to listen with Attention, to be able, in a very short Time, to judge, with tolerable Accuracy, of the Length of simple Sounds. But with regard to a dead Language, it is surely impossible for any one to judge exactly of the Quantity of those Syllables, concerning whose Articulation almost every Nation differ both in Opinion and Practice.

Supposing, however, that the Mechanism of the ancient Versification should sufficiently determine the Quantity of the Syllables of ancient Languages; yet I should be glad to know what Influence such Quantity must necessarily have over the Syllables of modern Tongues. Is it that,

that, being spelt in the same Manner; they must be pronounced in the same Manner? It hath been already observed, that the same Letters have not the same Sound, even among contemporary Languages: How then are we to judge of the Force of those made Use of many Ages ago?

In Words, indeed, immediately derived from the Latin or Greek, there is all the Reason in the World for preserving the particular Quantity of the Syllables, unless such a Mode should contradict any general Rule or established Mode of Pronunciation in our own Tongue: In which Case, the Propriety of abiding by a general Rule, ought to supersede the Considerations of the Etymology or Orthoëpy of a particular Word; and that, because no Word is properly naturalized, if the Mode of pronouncing it differ from the common Practice of pronouncing other English Words so spelt; such Words, however frequently made Use of, being in Fact still foreign.

But whatever may have been the Rules by which the Writers on English Prosody have determined the *Quantity* of Syllables,

the following Remarks may serve to shew they are precarious and defective.

In the first place, the Mode of estimating the Length of Syllables in English hath been hitherto absurd. It is a very proper, as it is the only Way of judging of the Quantity of a Syllable in a dead Language, to deduce it from the Part it bears in the Metre of the Poets. But the Harmony of English Numbers doth not depend altogether on the Times of its metrical Feet; so it is absurd to think of deducing the Length of the particular Syllables composing them, from the Place they occupy in the Verse.

Mr. Say, in his Treatise on the Harmony and Variety of Numbers; and after him, Mr. Mason, on the same Subject, tell us, that *Custom* and *Accent* make those Syllables short which are naturally long, or contract a double Time into a single one.

Again, we are told by the latter, that
 “ though a Syllable be naturally short,
 “ yet if it be accented in the ordinary
 “ Way of Pronunciation, or the Sense
 “ requires it to be read with an Empha-
 “ sis, it becomes a long Quantity.”

To

To these, I may add the Authority of Mr. Samuel Johnson, who, in the Grammar prefixed to his Dictionary, tells us, that *Accent* and *Quantity*, in English Versification, is the same. For my part, however, I conceive that the surest and most simple Way of judging of the Length of Syllables in a living Language, is to appeal to the Ear, and to the Time taken up in their Pronunciation.

It is very certain, that their natural Length is increased or diminished when they are connected together in a Sentence, as the Sense may require the Voice to dwell on, or to hasten over such Syllables, *i. e.* as they are significant or insignificant. Indeed, the Length of the whole Clause or Sentence should, in the same Manner, be adapted to its Importance in the whole Discourse. It is to be observed, nevertheless, that Emphasis doth not consist in lengthening the Syllable, as these Writers intimate, any more than in raising its Tone, according to others; but in giving it *Force*, or pronouncing it *full* and *loud*.

It is true that, to pronounce a Syllable as *full* and *loud* as possible, we must give it its whole natural Length; but if this be

exceeded, the Consequence is not emphatical, but a feeble Drawl. On the other hand, as to Syllables naturally short, no *Accent* or *Emphasis* can possibly make them long: For Instance, the Syllables *well*, *rap*, *so*, what *Emphasis* can convert them into *weel*, *rape*, *sope*? Again, what Force of *Accent* or *Emphasis* can give the Monosyllables *and*, *band*, *stand*, the same Length as the last Syllable in *command*?

The Length of the unaccented short Syllables in a Verse, depends entirely on the Time allotted for the longest emphatical Word in the Verse or Sentence; the Length and Loudness of every other Word in that Sentence being greater or less in Proportion to the Degree of Significance and Importance, which it bears in Relation to such principal Word or Words.

Hence it is that, if neutral Words be made *short* in any Discourse, they are not made positively so, or reduced exactly to half the Time of long Syllables, but may be of various Lengths, agreeable to their Importance. Now, though it is in the Power of *Accent* and *Emphasis*, by enforcing one Syllable, and thereby giving it its natural Length, to render others

compa-

comparatively shorter; it doth not, as I before observed, make short ones long, and long short, or even neutral ones, either positively or indefinitely.

The Emphasis and Duration of the longest and loudest Syllables in a Verse, are certainly positive; for if either be carried to excess, *Speaking* degenerates into *Drawling* or *Roaring*. But the Duration of the shorter Syllables is purely relative, that of the shortest being indefinite, and limited only by the Audibility of the Sentence.

If the same Sentences were spoken at one Time with Deliberation, and at another with Impetuosity, it is certain the Length of the Syllables would be different; but the Length of any one Syllable would still bear the same Proportion to that of any other in the same Sentence, if spoken with equal Propriety.

Hence it appears, that the Beauty and Harmony of English Numbers do not depend on the sole Disposition of long and short Syllables: *Quantity*, with us, not consisting merely of *Tone* or of *Tune*, as it is supposed to have done among the Ancients: For it is very certain, that *Accent* supplies

106 *Of the Power and Use of Accent*

supplies the Place of Time in English Verse; that is, a short accented Syllable hath the same Force, and supplies the same Place in a Foot as a long accented one. It doth not hence follow, however, that the natural Length or Time of Syllables should be neglected, or considered as altogether the same Thing as Emphasis or Accent.

It is certainly a very commodious Way, which some Writers have hit upon, of getting rid of the Difficulty of ascertaining the Length of Syllables, by subjecting Time to Accent, and making such Syllables either short or long, just as they happen to stand in the Verse. We should read, however, with as little Propriety, by attending *solely* to the Stress of Accent and Emphasis (important as they confessedly are) as we should in entirely neglecting them for mere Time.

It would be attended also with equal Impropriety, if no other Distinction were made between long and short Syllables, than the usual Method of supposing one just twice as long as the other. The Absurdities into which the Advocates for this System fall, are, indeed, truly ridiculous,

Mason,

Mason, after making the above Distinction, and imputing to a short Syllable what he calls a *single Time*, confesses, that "there is a Difference in the single Times, some being in Reality, and in Length of Pronunciation, *more* than *two* of the single or short ones." And yet he supposes it in the Power of the Accent or Emphasis to prolong a short Syllable even to *three Times* its natural Length.

The same Thing, indeed, he says, is observable in the *Latin* Quantities, and was remarked by Quintilian. *Et longis longiores, et brevibus sunt breviores Syllabæ* *. But what doth this prove, except that the Emphasis, or natural Mode of Pronunciation, might possibly, among the Latins (as it doth with us) compensate for the various Length of Syllables in the Composition of Verse. This at least is certain, that it doth, by no means, prove the Propriety of the simple Distinction of Syllables merely into *long* and *short*.

If Syllables are *long* and *short*, there are undoubtedly *some* that are *neither*; it being

* Quintilian, Lib. ix. Chap. 4.

impossible, in such a Diversity, to pass from one positive Quality to another which is quite opposite, without encountering some in the Midway. It might, in Fact, be as well asserted, that there are no distinct Sounds between any given Note and its Octave, as to pretend there are not Syllables of different Lengths between a *Breve* of one Time, and a *Longum* of two Times.

The Censure of Isaac Vossius may possibly not be altogether just; but it must be allowed, that the common Notions with regard to the Difference of the Syllables, hath given great Room for his asserting, “ That there is nothing but
“ Confusion of Quantities in the modern
“ Odes.—That the Moderns have no re-
“ gard to the natural Quantity of Sylla-
“ bles; and have introduced an unnatural
“ and barbarous Variety of long and short
“ Notes, without any regard to the Sub-
“ ject and Sense of the Verse, or the na-
“ tural Pronunciation.”

To invalidate this Objection, it is said, among other Things, that, notwithstanding Accent and Quantity were two different Things among the Ancients, “ it is
“ impossible any such Distinction between
“ the

“ the Accents and Quantities can be observed in reading English, as one may presently be convinced, by making the Experiment *.”

Now, I am fully persuaded that the Experiment would determine the contrary, and that there cannot be a more vicious Custom in Reading than that of neglecting the natural Length of the Syllables, and confining the Rythmus or Metre of English Verse to a certain Number of Syllables, pronounced long or short, just as their Position in the Verse, or the Emphasis of the Sentence may require.

Mr. Mason, in order to justify the above-mentioned Assertion, gives an Instance, wherein a double Time, as he calls it, is contracted into a single one. And, indeed, Mr. Say, and others, tell us of a *customary* Method of contracting two short Syllables into one. The Custom, however, must be extremely vicious, and tend to great Confusion in Pronunciation.

The Example brought by Mason is the following Line.

Th' infernāl Sērpēnt; Hē it wās whōse Gūile.

* Mason on the Power of Numbers, Pages 10 and 11.

Here,

Here, continues this Author, the Syllables *in, nal, pent, whose*, which are naturally long, are all short by Accent. Now, I cannot possibly find out how these Syllables can naturally be equally long, or even nearly so; nor can I discover why the Syllable *in* (which if I did not call a short one, I should denominate a *neutral*. i. e. neither long nor short) should, by Position, be here rendered short, especially when it is joined to the short Syllable *the*. Two short Syllables may be well enough blended into a long one, but to have a long and a short both contracted into a short one, is rather going too far. It is the more needless also, as the Verse might be almost as well read without it. Again, as to the Word *whose*, there is not the least Pretence for its being accounted or pronounced short in this Place, except what is deduced from the arbitrary and mechanical Rule, laid down by some for the Structure of an heroic Verse.

Mr. Johnson defines *Verseification* to be the Arrangement of a certain Number of Syllables, according to certain Laws. This certain Number of Syllables in heroic and tragic Poetry, he declares to be

ten;

ten; in the Arrangement of which, he says, the Accents are to be placed on the even Syllables, every Line, considered by itself, being more harmonious as this Rule is more strictly observed *.

Now, that heroic Verses, thus formed, would be more *even* or *regular*, I grant; but I deny that they would be more *harmonious*, even considered separately †. I should be glad to know from what Principle of Nature it is, that the regular alternate Succession of five short and five long Syllables forms a more harmonious line than a different Succession or Disposition of such Syllables.

That *Verseification* consists of the Arrangement of Syllables, according to certain Laws, is very true; but the heroic Measure is not confined to a *certain Number* of Syllables; nor are the Laws of Arrangement necessarily such as Mr. Johnson hath asserted ‡.

* See Johnson's English Grammar prefixed to his Dictionary, Fol. Ed.

† A sufficient Proof of this will be given hereafter.

‡ This will be more fully demonstrated in treating of the *Harmony* of Verseification.

As a Proof of this Assertion, I shall quote some few convincing Lines, to shew that an heroic Verse is not confined to a certain Number of Syllables, and, at the same Time, to give as full a Demonstration, that, though the Accent doth sometimes supply the Place of Time, in forming the Quantity, yet that it cannot always do so to the Exclusion of Time, without destroying the Propriety, Beauty, and, I will add, *Harmony* of the Numbers.

There are no less, for Instance, than fourteen Syllables in the first, and twelve in the last of the following Verses.

*And many an amorous, many a humorous Lay,
Which many a Bard had chanted many a Day.*

And yet, there is not one that can be spared in the harmonious Repetition of those Lines. The vicious Custom of contracting our Syllables, in order to reduce them to the Standard of five accented and five unaccented, would make us read these Verses in the Manner following.

*And man' an am'r'us, man' a bum'r'us Lay,
Which man' a Bard had chanted man' a Day.*

But could any Thing be more barbarous than such Contractions, and Neglect of
the

the natural Length of the Syllables composing these Verses?

Again, we have a similar Example in the following Verse:

The wounded Bull

Roar'd bellowing, whilst rebellowing rang the Woods.

If Accent may always supply the Place of *Time*, and the Harmony of the Verse depends on a strict Adherence to the above Rules concerning Accent, which makes Syllables long or short by arbitrary Position, we must necessarily read the Verse thus,

The wounded Bull

Roar'd bell'wing, whilst rebell'wing rang the Woods.

On the other hand, if the Harmony of Verse principally consists, as I conceive it does, in the Consonance or Affinity which the Words of such Verse bear to their Meaning, or in their Propriety or Aptitude to express that Meaning, we should certainly find it in giving every Syllable of this Verse its full Sound and natural Length thus,

The wounded Bull

Roar'd bellowing, whilst rebellowing rang the Woods.

The discerning Reader will not only infer, from these Examples, the Necessity of making a Distinction between *Accent*

I

and

and mere *Time*; but also the like Necessity of considering *Quantity* in English Verse as compounded of both; the one being no more to be neglected in Reading with Propriety than the other.

SECT. XI. *Of English Numbers, or metrical Feet.*

It was observed, in the second Section, that Men could neither speak, nor be understood, by a regular Succession of uniform and unvaried Sounds; and, that hence the Voice would necessarily fall into a certain Kind of Modulation, both in Speaking and Reading.

This Modulation, it is presumed, first gave rise to the Invention of metrical Feet, or Numbers, which, being disposed in a certain Order, are denominated Verses. Of these Verses, again, there are various Kinds, according to the different Species of Feet made Use of, or the particular Modes of Disposition.

From observing the agreeable Effect of Numbers in poetical Compositions, the Orators adopted them in their prosaic Declamations; hence forming, what
is

is usually called, a *numerous* or flowing Stile.

Many, indeed, and surprising are the Stories recorded of the Effects of this Attention to numerous Composition, among the ancient Orators of Greece and Rome.

If it be true, however, (as some of the Learned assert) that the Ancients read by the Quantity * only, it is certain, that neither their Modes of Reading, nor of forming Syllables into metrical Feet, are at all applicable to the English Language.

This Point, it is true, hath been greatly laboured by some Writers, who have endeavoured to trace out the ancient Rythmus and Quantities in English Verse. But they have, in these Attempts, displayed a much greater Share of Learning than Ingenuity, as will appear from the slightest Review of those unsuccessful Attempts. Dr. Pemberton, Mr. Mason, and almost all others who have written on this Subject, admit, that Accent and Emphasis (which they say is an *Elevation* of the Voice) supply the Place of *Time* on every Word or Syllable on which they fall. The

* Meaning the *Time*, or the Length of the Syllables.

former says, that “ *the Emphasis implies greater Length in the Syllable* † :” And the latter, that the Syllables, when accented, are *considered as long* *. It is certain, however, as hath been already shewn, that there are Syllables which cannot be prolonged in the Pronunciation, notwithstanding the strongest Emphasis. It is clear then, that Accent and Emphasis do not actually give Time, but supply the Want of it in the Composition of metrical Feet. Nothing can be more absurd, therefore, than to persist in reducing English Numbers to the Dactyls, Spondees, &c. of the Ancients.

If, as Mr. Mason repeatedly affirms, the proper Accent and Emphasis is the chief Rule that determines the English Quantities; why are not the Value of these Accents determined, and the Feet measured by them, instead of the Standard of *long* and *short* Syllables, which is not applicable? The Humourist at Oxford, who formerly sold strong Beer by the Ell, was much such another Kind of a Meeter.

† Pemb. Observations on Poetry, Page 125.

* On the Power of Numbers, Page 11.

The Reason, however, is evident why the Degrees of Emphasis could not be estimated. This could not be done while it was held to consist in a Rising of the Voice; as by this Method those Degrees would have formed a musical Scale, and have at once betrayed the Absurdity of confounding the Tone of the Voice with its Energy and Force *.

It is for Want of having fixed on a proper Criterion, by which to judge of the Quantity of Syllables, that the Writer last mentioned finds it so very difficult to account for the Diversity of those metrical Feet he affects to discover in our English Verses. In his Endeavours to do this, indeed, he falls into the strange Inconfi-

* It is not without Difficulty that Persons can divest themselves of this Prejudice respecting the Elevation and Cadence of the Voice, in Speaking and Reading; it not being easy for those, who are unacquainted with Music, to distinguish between a *loud* Note and a *high* one. That I might not be mistaken, however, myself in this Particular, I repeated, at different Times, several Passages from Milton and other Poets, in the Hearing of one of the greatest Masters in that Science; who, after paying the utmost Attention to the several articulate Sounds in each Sentence, declared them to be all of the same Tone.

stency of denying that Accent and Emphasis have any Effect in raising the Voice at all. Thus, he tells us for Example, that “ The Drum is an Instrument which, “ in a wonderful Manner, shews the “ Force and Power of poetic Numbers ; “ for though its Sound be only a Monotony, yet it exactly expresses all the “ different Qualities of the several Feet. “ And when we beat those Numbers upon “ it, only by varying the Movement into “ *quicker* or *slower*, and making the Sound “ *stronger* or *softer*, the Mind is affected “ as much as it is by an Instrument that “ runs all the Notes of a Gamut †.”

Nothing can be more unexceptionable than what is advanced in the above Passage ; and yet this very same Writer tells us, elsewhere, that “ Emphasis is raising “ the Voice ; Cadence is falling it ; and, “ when rightly managed, is very musical *.”

When he comes to explain the Mechanism of Verse, however, and to enquire into the Composition of metrical Feet, we

† Essay on the Power of Numbers, Page 14.

* Essay on Elocution, Page 24.

see he is obliged to reject this Mode of Harmony entirely, even though he admits that Accent and Emphasis principally determine the Quantities of English Numbers.

The Futility of attempting to determine English metrical Feet, after the Rules of the Ancients, will farther appear by what this Author advances on the Subject of prosaic Numbers, and the Manner of examining the Feet of which any Period is composed.

There is so great a Parade of Learning, and so little Regard to Propriety on his Observations on this Subject, that I cannot resist the Temptation of quoting the two first, with his Introduction to them.

“ Concerning the Manner of reducing
“ prosaic Numbers, or examining the
“ Feet of which any Period is composed,
“ we are here (says he) to take Dionysius
“ for our Guide, who hath shewn us, in
“ various Instances, how prosaic Numbers
“ are to be reduced. To take one
“ out of many, let us see in what Manner
“ he examines the Numbers of that
“ celebrated Speech of Thucydides, which

“ he affirms to be full of Grandeur and

“ Dignity, and begins thus, $\text{Ὅι μὲν} \mid \text{πολ-}$

“ $\text{λοὶ} \mid \text{τῶν ἐν} \mid \text{θαδ' ἐ} \mid \text{ἡδ' ἡ εἰ} \mid \text{ρηκότων} \mid \text{ἔπαινε} \mid$

“ $\text{σιτόν προσ} \mid \text{θέτα τω} \mid \text{νομα τὸν} \mid \text{λόγου τον} \mid \text{δε.}$

“ Now that which gives such an Air of

“ Majesty to this Sentence (says he) is, that

“ each Member of it is composed of the

“ most sublime and generous Feet: For

“ in the first Member, which ends with

“ ἐρηκότων , the three first Feet are *Spon-*

“ *dees*, the fourth an *Anapaest*, the fifth a

“ *Spondee*, and the sixth a *Cretic*. And

“ in the second Member of the Sentence,

“ which begins with the Word ἐπαινεσι ,

“ the two first Feet are *Bacchics*, (which

“ he calls *Hypabacchics*) the third a *Cretic*,

“ and the two last Feet *Bacchics*; the

“ whole concluding with an odd Syllable,

“ which is common,

“ Now here I would make the follow-

“ ing Observations.

“ (1.) That in reducing Prose-Sen-

“ tences into their original Numbers,

“ there is no Necessity to confine our-

“ selves to dissyllable Feet only.

“ For in reducing the first Member of

“ this Sentence, Dionysius uses both the

“ dif-

or metrical Feet.

“ diffyllable and triffyllable Feet : But it
“ is capable of being reduced into all dis-
“ syllable Numbers thus, — $\bar{\text{Ο}}\iota \mu\bar{\epsilon}\nu \mid \pi\bar{\alpha}\lambda-$
“ $\lambda\bar{\alpha}\iota \mid \tau\bar{\omega}\nu \epsilon\bar{\nu} \mid \theta\bar{\alpha}\delta\bar{\epsilon} \mid \eta\delta\eta \mid \epsilon\bar{\iota}\rho\eta \mid \kappa\bar{\alpha}\tau\bar{\omega}\nu$. And
“ according to this Method of Reduc-
“ tion, you see there is but one feeble
“ Foot among them, viz. the *Pyrrhic* in
“ the fourth Place ; and even this is not
“ at all amiss, as it is there situated ; for
“ the *Spondee* immediately following cor-
“ rects its Rapidity, and gives it the
“ agreeable Air of an *Anapæst*.

“ Therefore (2.) in examining the
“ Numbers of a prosaic Period, it is usu-
“ ally the best Way to reduce them into
“ Feet of three Syllables rather than those
“ of two.

“ For this Reason ; because though
“ there may be several weak and base
“ diffyllable Feet in it, yet as they stand
“ in Conjunction with others of a better
“ Quality, they are strengthened and har-
“ monized, and become very good Feet
“ of three or four Syllables. Thus the
“ *Pyrrhic* and the *Trochee*, though they
“ are both weak and feeble Numbers of
“ themselves, yet, followed by a *Spondee*,
“ they

“ they gather Force, and the one has the
 “ Air of an *Anapaest*, and the other of a
 “ *Cretic*, which are both good trissylla-
 “ ble Feet. And therefore Dionysius,
 “ you observe, resolves the second Mem-
 “ ber of the Sentence into all *Trissyllables*;
 “ by which Division they appear to be
 “ all strong and generous Numbers:
 “ Whereas, were they to be divided all
 “ into Dissyllables thus — ἐπαίνεσι | τὸν
 “ προσθεῖα | τῷ νόμῳ τὸν | λόγον | τὸνδε,
 “ — there would appear to be no less than
 “ three *Trochees*, which of themselves are
 “ base and feeble Feet, and might tempt
 “ us to think that the Numbers were not
 “ good: But being all succeeded by a
 “ long Syllable, they are exalted and con-
 “ firmed, and assume the Grace and Force
 “ of a *Cretic*, which is a good trissyllable
 “ Foot.”

“ After this Example (proceeds Mr.
 “ Maſon) let us examine the Feet in the
 “ English Translation of the two first
 “ Verses of the Bible, and we shall pre-
 “ sently see how much the Grandeur
 “ of the Stile is owing to the Strength
 “ and Magnificence of the Numbers, in
 “ which

“ which the Translators are often very
 “ happy.

“ In the Beginning | God created the
 “ Heav’ns | and the Earth, | and the Earth
 “ | was without | Form and void; | and
 “ Darkneſs | was upon | the Face | of the
 “ Deep.

“ These three Sentences, thus reduced,
 “ appear to be made up of all the most
 “ generous Feet, viz. the Spondee, Cretic,
 “ Molossus, Bacchic, Iambic and Anapaest,
 “ without one weak or faltering Foot
 “ among them; unless it be the first,
 “ which is a *Dactyl*: And that being
 “ corrected by a long Syllable immedi-
 “ ately succeeding, becomes a good ini-
 “ tial Number.”

A very little Reflection will serve to
 convince the discerning Reader of the Fu-
 tility of the above Observations and Ap-
 plication. It is to be remarked, in the
 first Place, that, according to Mr. Maſon
 himself, even the Greek Passage he quotes
 from Thucydides, may be scanned dif-
 ferent Ways; that is, it may be either
 reduced

reduced into Feet that are *noble* and *generous*, or into those which are *base* and *feeble*. But is it possible that the Dignity and Grandeur of this Passage, if *real*, should depend on the Method of scanning it? Doth the Reduction of the Words into metrical Feet make any Alteration in the Words themselves? Is not their Harmony and Succession the same, whatever Way they are scanned, or whether they are scanned or not? A Person who doth not understand Greek, may well be tempted to think that Dignity and Grandeur in a great Degree chimerical, which is thus dependent on the Mechanism of Numbers.

Again, with regard to the Application of his Rules to the Translation of the Bible, I will suppose the Verses he hath cited divided in this Manner.

In the | Begin|ning God | creat|ed the |
Heav'ns and | the Earth, | and the | Earth
was | without | Form and | void; and |
Darkness | was up|on the | Face of | the
Deep.

In

In this Case, the Reader will see that the Passage will contain two Pyrrhics, and a Number of *Trochees*, all base and feeble Feet. It is yet evident, that the Words being unaltered, the real Dignity and Harmony of the Passage must be the same.

If, indeed, it be the Business of the Reader to make every Thing appear noble and great, whether it really be so or not, I grant that the Rule of Dionysius, here adopted by Mr. Mason, is a very good one; but if he is to represent Things exactly as he finds them, I do not see how any particular Method of scanning a Passage, can either add to, or deprive it, of its natural Beauties.

The like Error Mr. Mason falls into, with regard to the Measures of English Verse; some of those which he calls *Iambic*, having nothing essential to distinguish them from the *Trochaic*. Thus he quotes the following Imitation of Adrian's Address to his Soul, and the three first Stanzas of Mr. Pope's Universal Prayer, as Examples of the Iambic Verse.

ADRIAN'S

A D R I A N'S ADDRESS.

Poor lit|tle, pret|ty, stut|tering Thing! It
 Must we | no lon|ger live | together,
 And dost | thou prune | thy trem|bling Wing,
 To take | thy flight | thou know'st | not whither
 Thy hu|morous Vein, & thy pleas|ing Folly,
 Lies all | neglec|ted, all | forgot;
 And pen|sive, wav|ering, me|lancholly,
 Thou dread'st | and hop'st | thou know'st | not what,

P O P E'S UNIVERSAL PRAYER.

If I | am right, | O teach | my Heart,
 Still in | the right | to stay;
 If I | am wrong, | thy Grace | impart,
 To find | that bet|ter Way.
 Save me | alike | from fool|ish Pride,
 And imp|ious Dis|content;
 As ought | thy Wis|dom hath | deny'd,
 Or ought | thy Good|ness lent.
 Teach me | to feel | ano|ther's Woe,
 To hide | the Fault | I see:
 That Mer|cy I | to o|thers show,
 That Mer|cy show | to me.

It is certain that, by arbitrarily making accented Syllables *long*, and unaccented ones *short*, the above Verses are twisted in the Scanning into a Kind of mixt Iambic; but if the Iambic Measure be, as it is generally defined, *quick, light, and sprightly* †, and the Trochaic, on the other hand, *weak and languid*, I think it would be much more consistent with the usual Definition of these Measures, and with the Sense of the Verses, to scan them as Trochaics. This might be done with the Introduction of as few *Iambics, Spondees, and Dactyls*, as Mr. Mason hath introduced *Trochees, Spondees, Pyrrichs, Anapaests, and Amphibracchys*, especially if we take the same Liberty of setting off a supernumerary Syllable, as Mr. Mason hath done in scanning the following Verses, which he calls *Trochaic*.

Blest with | Sense, with | Temper | blest,

Wisdom | o'er thy | Lips pre|sides;

Virtue | guards thy | gen'rous | Breast,

Kindness | all thy | Actions | guides.

† Horace calls the Iambic Foot *pes citus*. It is also generally defined by the Moderns as a bold rapid Movement.

Ēv'ry | home-felt * | Blifs is | mine,

Ēv'ry | female | Grace is | thine ;

Chaste De|portment, | artlefs | Mein,

Converſe | ſweet, and | Heart ſe|rene.

Now, as no Reason can be given why the supernumerary Syllable may not be ſet off at the Beginning, as well as at the End of the Line †, what, if we ſhould ſcan theſe Lines after the Manner of Iambics, would not both the Sound and Senſe be equally conſiſtent ?

Bleſt | with Senſe, | with Tem|per bleſt,

Wiſ|dom o'er | thy Lips | preſides ;

Vir|tue guards | thy gen'rous Breſt,

Kind|neſs all | thy Ac|tions guides.

* It is to be obſerved, that theſe Writers do not always abide by their own Rules. The Monosyllable *I*, in the laſt Line but one, of the Verſes quoted from Pope's Univerſal Prayer, is made ſhort, though it be ſtrongly emphasized. Again, the laſt Syllable of the compound Word *home-felt*, cannot poſſibly be ſhortened in this Line, without injuring the Senſe.

† Mr. Maſon taking off one, and ſometimes two Syllables, from the Beginning of the Verſes he calls Anapaſts. At the ſame Time he makes no Scruple of making long and even *emphatical* Syllables ſhort, in order to adopt the Words to his ſuppoſed Meaſures.

Ēv'ry

Ev'ry homefelt Bliss | is mine,
 Ev'ry female Grace | is thine;
 Chaste | Deportment, artless Mein,
 Converse sweet, | and Heart | serene.

In like Manner, should we scan the Verses, before quoted as Iambics, converting them into Trochaics, thus,

Poor | little, | pretty, | fluttering | Thing!
 Must | we no | longer | live together,
 And | dost thou | prune thy | trembling | Wing,
 To | take thy | flight thou | know'st not | whither?

I conceive that the Trochaic Measure, which, according to this Writer, is “*naturally soft, languid, and flowing*,” would suit the Subject as well as, or better than, the Iambic. Be this, however, as it will, the Verses are still the same, scan them which Way you please, which shews how little applicable the ancient Measures are to English Poetry, and how much we are still at a Loss for a mechanical Criterion, by which to estimate the true Quantity of metrical Feet or Syllables.

This will appear still more conspicuous, on comparing some English Verses, whose Effects and Harmony are totally different,

K

and

and yet would be scanned, after the Mode of the Ancients, exactly in the same Manner.

There is a Passage in *Milton's Paradise Regained*, wherein he introduces Satan, recommending to our Saviour, the Study of the Athenian Orators.

Those Ancient, whose resistless Eloquence
Wielded at Will that fierce Democratic,
Shook th' Arsenal and fulmin'd over Greece,
To Macedon, and Artaxerxes' Throne;

In expatiating on the Beauty of these Lines, it hath been observed, that Milton hath here “ described the hasty Changes
“ of the Passions and Counsels of the an-
“ cient Orators, in the very Movements
“ of his Verse; at the same Time expres-
“ sing the *Vim Demosthenis*, the Force or
“ Vehemence of Demosthenes, in the
“ mere Situation of the Words *fierce* and
“ *resistless*, with an equal Burst of Thun-
“ der shaking the Arsenal, and Light'ning
“ at once over Greece to Macedon, and
“ the distant Throne of Artaxerxes; that
“ is, in the Apprehension of those Ages,
“ from one End of the Earth to another,
“ with a like *Vehemence*, Propriety and
“ *Rapidity* of Numbers *.”

* Say, on the Harmony of Numbers.

That these Verses contain much of that *Vehemence, Propriety, and Rapidity* of Expression, which is imputed to them, I do readily admit; but if the Numbers, of which they are composed, are justly estimated by the Succession of long and short Syllables, I cannot see how their Force or Propriety depends merely on their Numbers: For certain it is, that the Harmony and Mode of Expression in the following Verses is totally different; and yet there is exactly the same Succession of long and short Syllables, or the same Numbers in them as in the preceding:

The lofty Ship
Rode buoyant o'er the liquid Element,
Wafted by Winds, that blew in Symphony;
Not Gossamers e'er wanton'd in the Breeze
So placid, as her artificial Wings.

The Reader will see that, in this Imitation, I have not taken the Liberty to substitute *Accent* for *Quantity*; but have preserved not only the same Succession of long and short Syllables, but have placed the very Accents in the same Parts of the Lines, and have even imitated the Sounds, as far as the Subject would admit. This will

be more conspicuous on viewing them
closer together.

Those Ancient, whose resistless Eloquence
Rode buoyant o'er the liquid Element,
Wielded at Will that fierce Democraue,
Wasted by Winds, that blew in Symphony,
Shook th' Arsenal and fulmin'd over Greece,
Not Gossamers e'er wanton'd in the Breeze
To Macedon, and Artaxerxes' Throne;
So placid, as her artificial Wings.

We find none of the Powers of Thunder
and Lightning, that

Shook th' Arsenal, and fulmin'd over Greece,
To Macedon, and Artaxerxes' Throne ;

in the Numbers of the corresponding Lines,

Not Gossamers e'er wanton'd in the Breeze
So placid, as her artificial Wings.

And yet the Accents, and even literal
Construction of the Syllables, are very
nearly the same.

It is very evident, on thus comparing
these two Passages, that something more
than *Time* must enter into the Composition
of English Numbers. I am, indeed, sur-
prised

prised to find this ancient Criterion of Quantity, so much insisted on, as it is, by Writers who have been reduced to the Necessity of constantly breaking thro' their own Rules, to accommodate the Syllables in some Verses, to their imaginary Numbers.

The following Verses Mr. Mason calls Anapæstic, and scans thus.

With Hearts bold and stout,
We'll repel the vile Rout,
And follow fair Liberty's Call;
We'll rush on the Foe,
And deal Death in each Blow,
Till Conquest and Honour, crown all.

According to this Method of scanning, the Words *bold*, *we'll*, *vile*, *fair*, *deal*, *each*, *crown*, which are all naturally *long* Syllables, and most of them emphatical besides, are yet marked *short*. On the other hand, the last Syllable in *repel* is made long, tho' naturally short, and not to be lengthened by the Accent; as are also the first Syllables in *follow*, *liberty*, *conquest*, and *honour*; all of the same Nature. Nothing, surely, can be more palpable than the Absurdity of making *pel* long in the very same Line

Point of View. It is, therefore, a vain and fruitless Attempt to make one the Criterion of the other; nor have the *modern* Poets, who have endeavoured to imitate the Numbers of the Ancients *, been less successful in their Compositions, than the Critics, who have endeavoured to reconcile the Numbers of modern and ancient Poetry to the same Standard. As the ill Success of the former, however, hath sufficiently shewn, that modern Languages do not admit of a Kind of Verse altogether dependent on long and short Syllables; so one would have thought the latter might have been thence induced to consult *Nature*, rather than Authority, in their future Tracts on this Subject †.

Not that I deny the real Existence of this Species of Modulation; but what I contend for, is, that such Measures are merely *musical*, and not *poetical*; being adapted solely to such Verses as are written to be sung. It is very easy to write

* Of these were *Jodelle* among the French, and *D'Avenant* among the English.

† It is for this Reason, that all Attempts of this Kind are, at best, but literary Trifling, serving only *To make th' Unlearned stare, the Learned smile.*

English Anapæstic Verses*; but the above are not such, because they cannot be properly set to Music, without altering the natural Length of the Syllables. It is also possible to write *Iambic*, *Trochaic*, *Hexameter*, and every other Species of ancient Verse, in English; but, while Emphasis and Accent have so great a Share in the Composition of our Numbers, a bare Attention to the Length of Syllables would make but very lame and imperfect Verses.

Perhaps one great Reason for Writers having fallen into Mistakes on this Head, hath been their Neglect to make the proper Distinction between such Poetry as is written for Music, or intended to be sung, and such as hath been written merely to be read. Indifferent Poets have been

* For Instance, the following Stanza is, perhaps, as purely Anapæstic as our Language will permit, or the Critics may require.

We are lazy and stout,
 So that hearing a Rout,
 Of a Bull, or a Bear, let it be;
 With Delight we partake,
 Of the Sports of the Wake,
 Very joyous, indulging, our Glee.

some-

sometimes told in Raillery, that their Verses might be either *said* or *sung*. It is certain, however, that the greatest Defect of most Verses, is, that they can neither be *sung* nor *said*.

I do not know that any Writer hath taken Notice of this Distinction as being a very *essential* one in modern Poetry; and yet it certainly is so. In the Composition of heroic or other Poesy, intended for simple Recital, the *Accent* or Stress of the Voice, may supply the Want of *Time* in any Syllable; but, as it does not actually lengthen short Syllables, it will not answer the same End in Verses that are to be *sung*. Time is so very *essential* to Melody in Music, that nothing can supply its Place. It is necessary, therefore, in Verses written to be sung, that the natural Length of Syllables be constantly preserved; and that a short Syllable, however strongly accented, should never be adapted to a long Note instead of a Syllable naturally long.

It is farther necessary also that the *Feet* should either be all of equal Length, or that they should be so proportioned in
their

their Succession, as that they might be measured *per Arsin et Thesis* *; without which it is impossible that the Expressions of the Music, and of the Poetry, should coincide.

And yet so little are these Circumstances attended to, either by our *Composers* or *Writers*, that we have the Mortification to see our *vocal* Music in a State almost beneath Contempt, while that of *instrumental* Music advances daily towards Perfection.

But the farther Pursuit of this Subject would be foreign to my present Purpose; which is to consider Poetry, simply as it is to be *read*, not as it is to be *sung*. In this View, the Circumstance of *Time*, as it enters into the Composition of metrical Feet, is of no greater Importance to the Power and Harmony of English Numbers than that of the Force or Energy of the Voices or Syllables composing them; for I presume it hath been made sufficiently clear, that the Power and Harmony of English Numbers, do not consist

* Commonly called, by the Musicians, *beating Time*.

merely

merely in the Combination of long and short Syllables. Nay, it will still bear some Dispute whether the ancient Numbers consisted solely in this Particular; especially if we credit the wonderful Stories that are told us of their Effects, both in the Declamations of their Orators, and the Writings of their Poets. I have somewhere read of a Pedant, who asserted there was more true Harmony to be found in the Latin and Greek Hexameters of Virgil and Homer, than in the finest Airs that ever were composed by Handel or Corelli. In like manner, Mr. Sheridan tells us, that “ Foreigners used to listen
“ to the Greek Orators, though they did
“ not understand their Language, with as
“ much Pleasure as we do to the Italian
“ Singers, from the mere Delight they
“ took in the Harmony of their Utter-
“ ance.” But, if this be true, one can hardly imagine such Harmony dependent merely on the Modification of Times, or the Succession and Combination, however artful, of long and short Syllables. And yet some Writers maintain, that the Greeks used to read always according to Quantity.

Sup-

Supposing this Point, however, to be controvertible, and that they diversified the Tone of their Syllables in Reading; still preserving the Mode of Time; this would only make their Speaking still more resemble Singing. And, if we may form any Judgment of the Effects of vocal Music among the Ancients, from what we find among the Moderns, we shall not be over ready to attribute such astonishing Effects to the Influence of musical Recitative.

Nothing appears more probable, than that we are ignorant of some Circumstances which contributed to the Influence of ancient Numbers; for let a Modern recite their Compositions how he will, we find none of those Effects from such Recital, as are related of the Declamations of the Greeks themselves.

The Prejudices of those who are enthusiastically fond of Antiquity, may inspire them with wonderful Conceits, like that of the Pedant above-mentioned; but I will venture to say, the best Greek Scholar in both Universities, might rehearse the Oration of Demosthenes till his Lungs were tired, before he would find People listen
to

to him with the same Pleasure, as they take in hearing an Italian Singer recite the harmonious Verses of Metastasio.

Be all this, however, as it may, it is certain that the Constitution of English Numbers depends no less on the Strength and Weakness of the Voices composing them, than they do on their Length, *i. e.* their being uttered quick or slow.

Nor, indeed, are these the only Ingredients in their Composition. The Circumstances of *Harshness* and *Smoothness* are likewise to be considered. These are compatible both with *strong* and *weak*, *long* and *short* Sounds; so that a Measure or Foot, in English Verse, hath three essential Qualities in its Composition; the Syllables of which it is composed being either *long* or *short*, *loud* or *soft*, *harsh* or *smooth*. And hence arises that expressive and beautiful Variety we find in them, without our being obliged to sound them in different Tones, as if we were Singing, instead of Speaking.

To determine, however, in what Manner these several Qualities of Syllables are blended in the Composition of metrical Feet, and in what Cases they may be substituted

stituted for each other, is a Task too arduous to be included in the present Design †.

But were we perfectly acquainted with the Mystery of simple Numbers, as far as the Composition of each is separately concerned, we might still, nevertheless, have an imperfect Knowledge of those Circumstances, on which the Power and Harmony of numerous Composition depend. Numbers are but the Materials with which

_____ *to build the lofty Rime*;
it being from their artful Combination and Succession, that their Force and Beauty are properly displayed, as the same Feet, differently disposed, may form Verses very different both in Melody and Energy.

† The following, however, would be no incurious Problems to resolve: 1st. Why doth *Force*, i. e. the Stress of the Voice in Accent and Emphasis, supply the Place of *Time* in English Numbers? And in what Manner do they compensate each other? 2d. Are not *harsh* Sounds in Poetry introduced, like *Discords* in Music, to improve the Harmony, and with the same Success? —

SECT. XII. *On the Mechanism and Harmony of English Verse.*

Will it be said, “ that, however insufficient the Modes of *Tone* and *Time* are to explain the Energy and Harmony of English Numbers, their Combination must yet necessarily break in upon the *Propriety* of reciting *Poetry*, if poetical *Pause* and *Cadence* are to be in any Degree observed, in Reading.”

It is very true, it would so, in the Recital of most Poetry, especially if the Modulation of the Voice were regulated by the common Rules of *Pause* and *Cadence*. But the Distinction already made, between that Poetry which is to be *sung*, and that which is to be *said*, will assist us in setting this Matter in a true Light.

To this End, I shall begin with shewing the Difference between that natural Modulation of Voice which is common to Speech, and that arbitrary and mechanical Modulation which is peculiar to Poetry.

It has been observed, in the second Section, that a Number of Syllables pronounced

nounced successively in one uniform and unvaried Manner (that is, equally loud and long) would appear only as so many surd and unmeaning Sounds; and that therefore the Voice naturally falls into a Kind of Modulation in Speaking. This was exemplified in the following Words.

Be, what, you, will, so, you, be, still, the, same.

The Reason, however, why these Words so pronounced would be in a Manner unintelligible, is, that they would thus be deprived of the most essential Part of oral *Expression*, which consists in laying the Stress or Emphasis of Voice on Words or Syllables, in Proportion as they are significant; so that, the Words composing the above Line not being equally significant, there is a Want of *Expression* in such an uniform Mode of Utterance. But let us suppose the following Line substituted in its Room.

Tow'rd's four fair Nymphs, ran four tall Men full Speed.

In this Line, it is evident, that every Word should be pronounced equally strong, and in the same uniform Manner; all the
Modu-

Modulation it will admit of, being formed by the slight Pause at the Comma in the Middle. For if it be read otherwise, *i. e.* with any other Modulation, it would lose its *Expression*.

Thus, should we, for Instance, repeat it as an heroic Verse, after the common Method, it would run thus :

Tords four fer Nymphs, ran four tol Men full Speed.

Here we see that the arbitrary and artificial Modulation of the Verse, breaks in upon that natural Modulation, which is essential to Expression. It is this Difference between the natural and artificial Modulation of Prose and Verse, that hath induced some Writers on the Art of Reading, to lay it down as a positive Rule, that when you read Verse, you must not in the least attend to the Measure, the same Rules being to be observed in reading Poetry as in Prose.

But is not this the same Thing as to say that Poetry cannot be read at all, or at least no otherwise than as Prose? This, however, is not true. The Modulation, or mechanical Disposition of Pauses in

Poetry, is merely musical, and consists in the Modification or Combination of *Times*, or temporal Measures; and this is always reconcileable to the natural Modulation of Expression, when the Poet chuses to make it so. But, as in the Mechanism of English Verse, the Stress of the Voice is admitted to supply the Place of Time, the Poet frequently neglects the strict Observance of *Time* in Poems that are to be *read*; and, on the other hand, equally neglects the Observance of Accent in those which are to be *sung*.

Hence arise the Defects observed in the preceding Section, where the Reader will see Instances of strong emphatical Words so placed in the Measure, that they necessarily lose their Expression when repeated in the same Mode of Time as that in which they are *sung*. This is very common in Songs, and all Pieces written to Ballad Measures.

Such Liberties are taken in this Kind of Writing, that we find not only long and accented Syllables put in the Place of the short and unaccented, but even two Syllables put in the Place of one, and
sung

sung to one Note, and sometimes even one Syllable made to serve two distinct Notes†.

So little Attention, indeed, hath been paid to the true Cause of poetical Pause and Cadence, that we have very pretty Poets, and even judicious Critics, that have been mistaken in the Proportion of

† Example of a long accented Syllable put in the Place of a short one, adapted to the same Note.

I.

What though I have Skill to complain,
And the Muses my Temples have crown'd?
What though, when they hear my *soft* Strain,
The Sisters sit weeping around?

II.

Ah! Colin, 'tis all but in vain,
Thy Pipe and thy Laurel resign;
Thy fair One inclines to a Swain,
Whose Music is sweeter than thine.

There are few Verses better written for Music than these; and yet the Word *soft*, in the third Line of the first Stanza, is long and emphatical, instead of being short and insignificant as *a* in the third Line of the second Stanza, which answers, nevertheless, to the same Note. In Verses written with less Taste and Care, the Blunders of this Kind are as disagreeable to the Hearer, as troublesome to the Singer.

Time taken up in the Repetition of the several Parts of a Verse.

Mr. Webb, in his Remarks on the Beauties of Poetry; endeavours to account for the Monotony frequently to be met with in Mr. Pope's Verses, by imputing it to the Equality of Time, by which his Lines are divided. He instances, in particular, the following Passage from the Essay on Man:

All are but Parts of one stupendous Whole,
Whose Body Nature is, and God the Soul;
That chang'd through all, and yet in all the same,
Great in the Earth, as in th' Æthereal Frame;
Warm in the Sun, refreshes in the Breeze,
Glow in the Stars, and blossoms in the Trees;
Lives through all Life, extends through all Extent,
Spreads undivided, operates unspent.

“ Every Reader (says this Author) must
“ feel the ill Effect of the Monotony in
“ these Lines; the Cause of it is ob-
“ vious; this Verse consists of ten Sylla-
“ bles, or five Feet. When the Pause
“ falls on the fourth Syllable, we shall
“ find that we pronounce the six last in
“ the same Time that we do the four first;
“ so that the Couplet is not only divided
“ into

“ into two equal Lines, but each Line,
 “ with respect to Time, is divided into
 “ two equal Parts, as,

“ Warms in the Sun, || refreshes in the Breeze,
 “ Glows in the Stars, || and blossoms in the Trees.”

This Observation of Mr. Webb's, is approved by the ingenious Authors of the Monthly Review; who, in their Illustration of his Remarks, give the following musical Diagram of the first of these Lines.



Warms in the Sun, refreshes in the Breeze.

I should be glad, however, to know by what Authority, and for what Reason the Words, *in the*, are made *Crotchets* in the first Bar, and only *Quavers* in the second? They are equally emphatical in both Parts of the Sentence. Again, I should like to have a Reason given me, why these Words, *in the*, and even the accented Syllable *fresh* in *refreshes*, are accounted each but half as long as the Syllable *re* in the same Word? Never could

L 3 there

there be a Man upon Earth that pronounced the above Line as it is thus written.

There can be no Argument brought against pronouncing *in the*, in both Parts of the Sentence exactly alike. Let us see then how the other Words accord, to justify Mr. Webb's Assertion, that "the Verse is, with respect to *Time*, divided "into two equal Parts."

Warms in the Sun,
Refreshes in the Breeze.

It is amazing to me, how any Person that hath an Ear, could suppose these two Parts of the Line to be isochronal. Even the Word *Breeze* is longer than *Sun*, and how *warms* can be supposed to take up as much Time as *refreshes*, I can't conceive. A Musician, indeed, might have divided the Line at the fifth Syllable, and have pricked the Notes, and beat Time accordingly; but this would be a Stretch beyond poetical Licence.

But, even supposing the above Line to be equally divided in Point of Time, such Equality cannot, strictly speaking, be the Cause of *Monotony*, unless the Accents also were

were laid in the same Places. A Kind of Monotony, indeed, arises from the Succession of some of the above Lines, because the Accents in the Beginning of them lie upon the same Syllables ;

e. g. *Gréat in the Eárbh —*
Warms in the Sun —
Glow's in the Stars —

If the Seat of the Accents, however, be varied, let the Equality of the Pauses be as exact as it will, it will be productive rather of a *Monochrony* (if I may use the Term) than a *Monotony*. And thus we see, in every Case, what Confusion is occasioned by the Want of having made a proper Distinction between *Tone* and *Time*, in treating Subjects of rhetorical and poetical Harmony †.

† In Speaking of the Pitch and Management of the Voice, however, Mr. Sheridan appears to be sensible of this Distinction. “ Loud and soft, says he, in Speaking, is like “ the *forte* and *piano* in Music ; it only refers to the different Degrees of Force used in the same Key : Whereas “ high and low imply a Change of Key.” And yet he makes no Use of this Distinction, in treating of Accent and artificial Tones ; altho’ nothing can be more certain than that we do not change the Key in Speaking at every Pause.

Not that I suppose by the Word *Monotony*, thus generally used, the Critics meant to confine themselves to Tone, in the strict philosophical Sense of the Term, but to extend it also to the *Stress* or *Loudness* of the Voice. In this Sense, however, their confounding its Effects with those of Time, is equally exceptionable. It is very certain, that the Measures of Time, in the mechanical Structure of the Verse, ought to be strictly observed, as well in *Reading* as in *Writing* all such Poetry, as is to be set to *Musick*; because, as before observed, Time is essential to musical Harmony; and the Expression should be made to coincide with it. But as it is by no means so essential to Speech, or poetical Harmony, no mechanical System, or arbitrary Mode of Pause and Cadence *, should take place

* It is to be constantly observed, that, by *Cadence*, is not meant a Variation from *high* to *low*, as is generally understood, but from *loud* to *soft*; this being all the Cadence Propriety will admit of, in *Speaking* and *Reading*: That Diversification of Tone, which I treat of hereafter, and which depends on the Sense of the Period, being very improperly termed *Cadence*.—The Distinction here made between musical and poetical Harmony, is not new or singular. The celebrated Author of *ELFRIDA*, says, that
the

in Prose, or in any Kind of Poetry; to the Prejudice of natural *Expression*.

I do not deny, that Harmony is produced by a regular and mechanical Combination of long and short, loud and soft Sounds: Such Combination is, in many of our Odes, especially when heightened by chaste Rhimes, extremely pleasing. But if the Succession of those Sounds be too uniform, either in respect to Accent or Time, it will necessarily fatigue, and be displeasing to the Ear. I can discover, however, but very little Harmony in the mere uniform and alternate Succession of a long and short, or a loud and soft Syllable, as is required, by our Prosodists, in the Mechanism of our English heroic Verses of ten Syllables.

It is evident, indeed, that there really is but very little; since the simple Repetition of a very few Lines, written in this unvaried Manner, is intolerably tiresome. If the Reader doubts of this, he may try the Experiment on Pope's Homer, most

the different Cadences, &c. without which modern *Musick* cannot subsist, are entirely improper for the Expression of *Poetry*.

of

of Addison's Poems, and particularly on Mr. Glover's *Leonidas*. It is true, the Uniformity of Sound, in reciting these Poems, is varied a little by diversifying the Pauses made in the Recital; but the common Rules laid down for the harmonious Diversification of such Pauses are as arbitrary, and as inconsistent with natural Expression, as those which concern the Succession and Combination of the Measures; nor are Writers agreed even about these Rules.

Mr. Mason says, "that there is the same possible Variation of the Cæsural Pause in *English*, as there is in the *Latin* Heroics." He admits, however, with Lord Kaimes and others, that it is *unnatural* for a Pause to divide a Word. Now I should be pleased to know from what *natural* Principles it is, that they deduce their Rule for pausing at some particular Parts of the Verse, in Preference to others?

In the Elements of Criticism *, we find this Point greatly laboured, and an apparently accurate Distinction made be-

* Vol. ii. Page 409.

tween Pauses and *Semi-pauses*. But Pauses are not exactly split in two, any more than Syllables; but are of different Lengths, and are diversified as the Variety of Expression requires. What the noble Author advances on this Head, therefore, is in a great Degree chimerical. Mr. Say hath shewn, from the Practice of Milton, that the Pause may be made with Beauty and Propriety in every Part of the Line in heroic Verse †.

This, however, cannot be, if the alternate Succession of long and short Syllables, and a mechanical Regularity of Pause be deemed essential to such Verse. It is asserted, as before observed, by Johnson and others, that the Harmony of Verse is more or less compleat, as such mechanical Regularity is adhered to; but I will appeal to the Reader, after he hath perused the following Lines, from Dryden, Pope, Addison, &c. whose Examples are brought in favour of the regular Mechanism; and from Milton alone, in Justification of the irregular.

† Essay on the Numbers of Paradise Lost, Page 136.

In Mr. POPE's Pastorals, we have the following Description of *Winter*.

Behold the Groves, that shine with silver Frost,
Their Beauty wither'd, and their Verdure lost !
No grateful Dews descend from Evening Skies ;
No Morning Odours from the Flowers arise ;
No rich Perfumes refresh the fruitful Field ;
No fragrant Herbs their native Incense yield !
The balmy Zephyrs, silent since her Death,
Lament the ceasing of a sweeter Breath.

Again, in his Description of *Summer*.

But see, the Shepherds shun the Noon-day Heat ;
The lowing Herds to murm'ring Brooks retreat ;
To closer Shades the panting Flocks remove ;
Ye Gods ! and is there no Retreat for Love ?

DRYDEN, equally regular in his Numbers, on a very different Subject, makes Juvenal satirize the Romans for their Neglect in cultivating their own Language, in the following Terms,

In Greece their whole Accomplishments they seek :
Their Fashion, Breeding, Language, must be Greek ;
But raw, in all that does to Rome belong,
They scorn to cultivate their Mother-Tongue.
In Greek they flatter, all their Fears they speak,
Tell all their Secrets ; nay, they scold in Greek.

Mr. ADDISON, in the following Verses, gives as much Melody to this mechanical
Form

Form of Versification, as perhaps it is capable of admitting.

For wherefoe'er I turn my ravish'd Eyes,
Gay gilded Scenes, and shining Prospects, rise:
Poetic Fields encompass me around,
And still I seem to tread on classic Ground:
For here the Muse so oft her Harp has strung,
That not a Mountain rears his Head unsung;
Renown'd in Verse each shady Thicket grows,
And every Stream in heavenly Murmurs flows.

That there is a Species of Harmony resulting from the Regularity of these Lines, is not to be disputed; but is it equal to that of the following Verses of Milton, wherein this Regularity of Measure is broken through, and the Pauses made in every Part of the Line?

Yet not the more
Cease I to wander, where the Muses haunt,
Clear Spring, or shady Grove, or sunny Hill;
Smit with the Love of sacred Song; but chief
Thee, Sion, and the flow'ry Brooks beneath,
That wash thy hallow'd Feet, and warbling flow,
Nightly I visit. —
Then feed on Thoughts, that voluntary move
Harmonious Numbers: As the wakeful Bird
Sings darkling; and in shadiest Covert hid,
Tunes her nocturnal Note. —

PARADISE LOST, Book iii.

In

158 *On the Mechanism and Harmony*

In the following Passages, taken from the same Poem, the regular Mode of alternate long and short Syllables, is equally broken through, and with equal Harmony.

Thammuz came next, behind,
Whole annual Wound, in Lebanon, allur'd
The Syrian Damsels, to lament his Fate,
In amorous Ditties, all a Summer's Day;
While smooth Adonis, from his native Rock,
Ran Purple to the Sea.

Harmony

So smooths her charming Tones, that God's own Ear
Listens delighted.

Might it not be said of the Numbers of these, and many other similar Passages in Milton, in the Language of *Camus*;

How sweetly did they float upon the Wings
Of Silence!

At every Fall smoothing the raven Down
Of Darkness till it smil'd

Such Sounds as these will take th' enchanted Soul
And lap it in Elysium!

I am not insensible that Readers, whose Taste is vitiated by their having been accustomed to the unvaried Uniformity of Numbers in our *correct* modern Poets, will at first be at a Loss to conceive, wherein the superior Harmony of Milton's Verses

con-

consists. No Matter; they must have very debauched Ears, indeed, if they do not perceive the Fact, which is all I aim at for the present. They may think, perhaps, there is no other Way of scanning English Verses, than by laying a strong Accent on every even Syllable,

With Midas' Ears committing short and long.

I shall endeavour, before I dismiss this Subject, however, to point out a much more general and satisfactory one; equally applicable to all Kinds of Poetry: For it is to be observed, that Variety in Measures and Pauses, is not a mere Indulgence (as it is commonly supposed) allowed to *Blank Verse*. Poems in *Rhime*, if well written, will admit of equal Variety, without the Necessity of Sinking the Rhime; but I do not pretend that they would be as *easily written*.

Thus, in two Passages from Addison and Prior, quoted by Mr. Say, we have an Instance of this Variety, being, in some Degree, successfully put in Practice.

So when an Angel, by Divine Command,
With rising Tempests, shakes a guilty Land;
Such

160 *On the Mechanism and Harmony*

Such as, of late, o'er pale Britannia past,
Calm and serene, he drives the furious Blast;
And, pleas'd th' Almighty's Orders to perform,
Rides in the Whirlwind, and directs the Storm.

ADDISON'S CAMPAIGN.

When great Augustus govern'd ancient Rome,
And sent his conquering Bands to foreign Wars:
Abroad when dreaded, and belov'd at home,
He saw his Fame increasing with his Years;
Horace, great Bard, so Fate ordain'd, arose:
And bold as were his Countrymen in Fight,
Snatch'd their fair Actions from degrading Prose,
And set their Battles in eternal Light.

PRIOR. *Ode on the Battle of Ramellies.*

That Blank Verse hath an Advantage
over Rhime, in the Admission of a greater
Variety in its Harmony, as Mr. Say and
others assert, is not absolutely denied:
But of what Kind is this Advantage? I
believe it will be found rather an Advan-
tage to the *Writer* than the *Reader*.

It is said to be very difficult, to express
the various Passions and Emotions of the
Mind with Propriety in Rhime. It un-
doubtedly is so; but that it is not impos-
sible, hath been confessedly shewn by Spen-
ser, Waller, Dryden, and many others*.

* See Dryden's Fables; and particularly Theodore and
Honorio from Boccace; and his Cock and Fox from Chaucer.

Till it be proved, therefore, that the Verse, which is written with *least Difficulty*, gives the greatest Pleasure to the Reader, I shall never conceive it properly said that Blank-Verse hath an Advantage over Rhime. That Blank-Verse-Writers have an Advantage over those who write in Rhime, is certain; as their Defects are less obvious to common Readers; and were they bound to the Shackles (as they are called *) of Rhime, they would never be capable of making a Verse as long as they lived. But this is no Standard of the Merit of the Verses when written. It is very possible, though I will not say it is very easy, to give Poems, written in Rhime, all the Variety of Measure and Pause which Blank-Verse is capable of, without diminishing any Part of that Harmony, of which Rhime is productive. This, however, is not to be done by the slovenly Way of running indiscriminately the Sense of one Line into one another, without Regard

* They might as well, however, compare a Lord-Mayor's Golden Chain, to the Iron Gyves of the Prisoners in Newgate. The Fetters of Rhime, as the Poet says, are worn not for restraint but *loveliest Ornament*.

to the Pauses of natural Expression; a Custom neither authorized by Sense or Sound. There is as much Difference between the Effects of Ease and Indolence, as between real Elegance, and the ridiculous Affectation of it. It is the Business of true Taste to distinguish both.

After all, it is, nevertheless, certain that Rhime is better adapted to Stanzas written for Music, than to heroic Verses intended to be read: Not, however, because Rhime, in well-written Verses, must of Necessity break through the Propriety of natural Expression; but because the Returns of Rhime have the greatest Effect, when they are quick, and are made in Times exactly equal and regular.

There is also another Reason, the Cause of which will be explained hereafter; and that is, that the Length of an heroic Verse is too great for the happy Success of Rhime; which was originally adapted to very short Measures, and should have been rejected by the Poets when they exceeded eight Syllables; since it is very evident that the mechanical Structure, or regular Movement of our rhiming heroic

heroic Verses, is derived from the Leon-
tine Measures which chimed at every
Hemistich.

We may laugh, indeed, at the barba-
rous Jingle of such Verses, because they
are really barbarous, if compared with the
Hexameters of the Ancients. As to the
Use and Effects of the Rhime itself, how-
ever, they are much more conspicuous in
such Verses: e. g. the following despica-
ble Lines from Muretus and Salerna.

*Brixia, vestrae merdosa Volumina vatis,
Non sunt nostrates tergere digna Nates.*

Ut Vites pœnam de potibus incipe Cœnam.

*De planctu cudo mitrum cum carmine nudo
Mingere cum bumbis, rest est saluberrima lumbis.*

It is plain that the Rhime in these
Verses, as well as in our English Stanzas*,

* Not the Stanzas of Spencer and Fairfax: which, in-
stead of being an Exception to this Rule, are the strongest
Proofs of it; the Rhimes dragging after the long Lines
in their Stanzas, making the Verse sometimes intolerably
tedious and heavy to the Ear. In plaintive Compositions,
indeed, this slow Return of the Rhime hath a pleasing
Effect; as, in Hammond's Love Elegies; and Grey's Elegy,
written in a Church-yard. But this is a Species of Writ-
ing to which Rhime is in a peculiar Manner adapted.

serves to enliven the Measures, and give a Kind of Melody to the Verse. But if, on the contrary, the Rhimes were only at the Close of each Line, the very Intent and Design of them would be defeated.

As an Example of this, take the following Lines from Drayton's *Polyolbion*, where the Rhime is almost entirely useless.

Of all the Cambrian Shires their Heads that bear so high
And farth't survey their Soils with an ambitious Eye,
Mervinia for her Hills, as for their matchless Crowds,
The nearest that are said to kiss the wand'ring Clouds,
Espécial Audience craves, offended with the Throng,
That she of all the rest neglected was so long;
Alledging for herself, when, through the Saxon's Pride
The Godlike Race of Brute to Severn's setting Side
Were cruelly inforced, her Mountains did relieve
Those whom devouring War else every where did grieve.

In these Verses the Rhime hath very little Effect either to enforce or disturb the natural Expression; so that were it not for the Transposition of the Words the whole might be read as Prose, and some of it very indifferent Prose too.

In heroic Verses of *ten* Syllables, the Rhime hath a greater Effect than in the foregoing; but it is evident, by a capital
Pause

Pause usually made in the Middle of each Line, dividing it into Hemistichs, that a Rhime is there wanting to compleat the Melody, after the true Gothic Original.

The Truth is, that the Mechanism of English Verse, as well as that of more modern Nations, is founded on heterogeneous Principles; which are not easily reconciled.

The most obvious Species of Poetic Harmony, and what is most likely to suggest itself to barbarous Nations, is that of Sound, abstracted from Time. The Use of Time in Harmony becoming known only as People acquired some Idea of Music as a Science. The first Verses that were written, therefore, in such Languages as would admit of it, were probably in Rhime. Next to the Chiming of Sounds, an Equality in the Number of articulate Sounds, between that Chime, was a simple and obvious Improvement in Versification. The Restraining, however, which the first Poets must lie under, in diversifying their Subject, and expressing the various Emotions and Passions, by such an uniform Iteration of Sounds, would naturally render

them impatient to throw it off, or change it for some other Species of Harmony more capable of Variety. It is no Wonder, therefore, that the Mode of Time or Quantity, took place, in such Languages as would admit of it, in Proportion as the People grew civilized, and the Arts began to make themselves known. Hence in the polished Nations of ancient Greece and Rome, we find the Mode of Time or Quantity hath the chief Place in their Profody; the Jingle of Sounds being entirely neglected.

Barbarism having taken Possession of Europe, for some Time, after the Destruction of these great Republics; we may suppose the Poetry of each Country to be in its earliest and rudest State; viz. constituted of mere Number and Rhime †. It

† Mr. Johnson, indeed, tells us, in his History of the English Language, that “ the first Poetry of the Saxons “ was without Rhime, and consequently must have depended upon the QUANTITY [meaning, as I apprehend, “ the Variety of LONG and SHORT] of their Syllables.” In Time, however, he observes, “ they began to imitate “ their Neighbours, and close their Verses with correspondent Sounds.”

It was natural, at the Revival of Letters, for the monkish Writers, who possessed and sought to propagate the ancient Learn-

Now, I will not enter into a Dispute, whether the Mode of *Time* or of *Sound* were the most obvious of the two, in the Formation of poetical Harmony. As that of *Time*, however, seems, from the Example of the Greeks and Romans, to be the more perfect of the two, I should hardly think the latter was hit upon first, and afterwards rejected for that of *Sound*. If it be so, however, it argues something in Favour of that Practice, which was thus adopted after so good a Method was already known. Be this, however, as it may, Mr. Johnson gives no Proof that the first Poetry of the Saxons was without Rhime; and, if he did, the Inference he draws, that its Harmony must have depended upon *Quantity*, viz. *Time*, does not follow. There is a Species of Melody arising from a Regularity in the Repetition of merely a certain Number of articulate Sounds, accompanied by a Variation in the Modes of *loud* and *soft*; where both *Time* and *Rhime* are neglected. There is also a Species of Melody arising from other Combinations.

Wormius informs us, that the ancient islandic Poets made Use of a great Variety of poetical Measures: He enumerates, indeed, no less than 136 different Kinds, besides that of Rhime. He tells us also, that the Harmony of their Verses did not depend on the *Quantity* of the Syllables, but consisted entirely in Alliteration. The Anglo-Saxon Poets also frequently made Use of the same Kind of Alliteration. There were farther, many other little Gothic Niceties, which served to constitute a Species of Poetry among the early Bards.

ing, to endeavour, in their Latin Verses, at uniting the classical and the barbarous Modes of Versification; in order to recommend their Poems, by adapting them to the Taste of the Times. At the same Time, as their Languages were daily improving by the Introduction of Latin and Greek Words, it was very natural for such Writers, in composing Verses in their own Tongue, to introduce in some Degree the ancient Mode of Prosody along with them.

It appears to have been from this Commixture that English Prosody hath taken its Rise. And hence it is that we find Accent, or the Stress of the Voice, substituted for the Length of its Utterance; and Rhime made Use of in Verses to which Quantity seems better adapted.

Thus, from the Gothic Source we deduce the Rules laid down for an equal Number of Syllables; the alternate Movement of *loud* and *soft*; the mechanical Regularity of Pause, and Cadence, and Rhime.

From the classical Source, we deduce the Mode of Scanning by long and short Sylla-

Syllables ; of the Modulation of Feet and Measure * ; and the true Method of forming harmonious Periods in general. The latter, however, is gained by studying the Example, and imitating the Manner of the Ancients, not from pursuing any Precepts, to be deduced from them, applicable to our own Language.

To all this it may be objected, that, as Rhime is admitted to be peculiarly applicable to the Ode, and such short-lined Poetry, it is very strange that the ancient Greeks and Romans, if Rhime had been ever known among them, should have so totally excluded it even from those very Pieces ; whereas it is found very difficult, in most modern Languages, to write Poetry of almost any Kind without Rhime.

In Answer to this it may be observed, that it is more than probable the Greek and Latin Tongues, even in this earliest State, were ill adapted to Rhime : But

* Thus the ancient Measures, as hath been already observed, may be successfully preserved in English, as they really are, where they have a good Effect ; as in Odes, Songs, &c. but then the Rhime must be preserved likewise, or else they will seem very harsh and unharmonious to an English Ear ; as is exemplified hereafter.

were

were it otherwise, it is no Wonder that a polished and learned Nation should effectually discountenance and suppress any Species of Writing, if the End intended to be answered by it, could be effected by a superior Method. The Want of Examples, therefore, of Rhime to be found among the elegant Productions transmitted to us from the Ancients, is no Proof that the first Poetry of either the Greeks or Romans, was not written in Rhime. With regard to the latter Part of the Objection; it will be effectually invalidated, by taking a comparative View of the different Idiom and Construction of the ancient and modern Languages.

The English, and all those Tongues which retain any considerable Share of the Teutonic Stock and Idiom, are remarkably addicted to Rhime; the numerous Similarity of Sounds frequently causing us to fall into it in common Conversation. This is, by no Means, the Case with the Latin and Greek, as they were written in the Times of Homer, and of Virgil. It was, therefore, with great Propriety observed by the late ingenious Dr. Byrom, that

that the Greeks and Romans did not avoid Rhime merely on the Account of the Meanness of its Harmony; but that their Language was unfit for it †.

On the other hand, the English Language is applicable with as little Success to the Numbers of the Ancients. Thus,

† See his *Contest*, on this Subject, with Mr. Cumberbach: In which we have the following Lines, in Answer to his Antagonist's imputing Rhime to a false Taste.

Rhime is false Taste! — And then you add beside —
And what the learned Ancients all avoid. —

What learned Ancients? Let me ask *what all*

Into this Taste were so afraid to fall?

For as to those of Greek and Roman Stem
Avoiding Rhime — why Rhime avoided them.

Nature of Language, upon rhiming Feet
Forbad the two Antagonists to meet.

This is no more a Reason to defame

Our Rhimes in English, than for us to blame

The several Idioms, which those Tongues have got,
And we avoid — that is, we *have them not*.

The Doctor's Opinion, however, is but little justified by his Practice in these Verses; the Rhimes of which are certainly disgustful, as they break in upon the natural Expression. It should be an unvariable Rule with Rhimers to have the Pause of a Comma, at least, at the Close of every Line.

Speak-

speaking of the British Muse, the Doctor says,

— When you chain her Lyrics to your Laws,
Then she looks blank, and there she makes a Pause;
As well she may,—if all her Stock you vest
In blank Iambic, and its varied Rest:
One Edict farther, if your Preface goes,
Adieu to Poetry, and all is Prose.

Mr. Mason, indeed, is of Opinion, that
“ the soft Iambic, which the English Lan-
“ guage falls easily into, might have a
“ good Effect, even in Lyric Measure,
“ without Rhime.” Mr. Cumberbach,
Mr. Say, and others, have been of the
same Opinion; which cannot be better
confuted than by the Examples they
themselves have brought to justify the
Assertion.

Mr. Say, gives us, among other Pieces
of the same Kind, the following Imita-
tion of the sixteenth Ode of the third
Book of Horace.

Dance, enclos'd in Tow'rs of Brass,
Strong Iron Doors, and opening Dogs,
Wakeful, had well secur'd by Day,
Had well secur'd by Night;
If Jove and Venus had not mock'd
The jealous Sire—so Fables tell—
Vain

Vain Iron! vain Brass! transform'd to Gold,
He won the greedy Maid.
When Gold appears, the Guards retire,
The Floods divide, the Rocks are rent;
Not Thunder flings the fiery Bolt
With such resistless Power.
Subjects their Kings, and Priests their Gods
Exchange for Gold. The Gownman Right
And Wrong confounds: For Gold he pleads,
For Gold betrays his Cause.
Touch'd by thy stronger Force, tow'rd thee
The Compass veers, almighty Gold!
Before thee Wisdom, Valour, Sense
And Virtue are no more! &c. &c.

Mr. Cumberbach hath attempted, in
like manner, Horace's Ode in Praise of a
Country Life; from which I shall also
quote a few Stanzas.

Who thus amus'd forgets not soon
Love's soft Distress? perchance
A chaste and loving Wife keeps neat
His House and charming Babes,
Her Part sustaining (happy State
Of Wedlock, often found
Beneath thatch'd Roof) laborious, swift,
And Sun-burnt, she betimes
Uprising, wholesome Breakfast sets
In order; or at Ev'n
Her weary Spouse expecting, rears
The chearful Fire; now drains
Her milky Charge, rejoic'd to quit
Their swelling Load; now crowns
The sparkling Bowl, and friendly heaps,
With Chear unbought the Board, &c.

How

How much more poetical is the Versification of the same Ode, by the Ingenious Author of the celebrated Pastoral, *My Time, O ye Muses, &c.*

While thus amus'd, and thus employ'd,

Who is there that would heed,

Would all the Mischiefs dire abide,

That Love is wont to breed ?

Or if a chaste endearing Wife,

His rural Bliss shall share,

She chears the neat domestic Life,

Sweet prattling Babes her Care.

With smoth'ring Warmth prepar'd to burn

The dry old Log she lays ;

And, if her weary Spouse return,

Revives the focal Blaze.

Of folded Flocks, from Dales and Hills,

The milky Treasure stor'd ;

Fresh clean-brew'd Wine she draws, and fills,

With Chear unbought, the Board.

Dr. Watts, indeed, hath written an Ode on the Day of Judgment, in Imitation of the ancient Lyric Measure, which corresponds pretty exactly with the Time and Metre of the Sapphic ; but even this doth by no Means prove the Aptitude of the English Language to the ancient Measures, or their Power of pleasing a Modern Ear without Rhime.

It

It is certain, after all, that as Rhime loses its Effect in long Verses, and cannot be successfully placed where there is not a natural Pause to be made in the Expression, it is never used with so much Propriety as in Verses of six or eight Syllables. To be convinced of this, we need only turn to the Tales and Fables of *Prior*, *Gay*, *Lloyd*, *Smart*, and some others; in which the Returns of the Rhime are made with so much Propriety and Ease, that they have all their Effect, without ever breaking in upon the Beauty of the natural Expression; whereas, in the Structure of an heroic Verse of ten Syllables, the Verse is either divided by a Pause into Hemisticks, or, if it admit no natural Pause, it degenerates into mere Prose.

It appears, from the above Considerations essential to the Harmony of Verse, that the natural Pauses in the Expression should not be at too great a Distance. And hence it is that blank Verse may be extremely harmonious, when composed of flowing Hemisticks, though the Lines, taken separately, do not accord with the Mechanism of the Couplet. To instance only the following Lines, taken from
among

176 *On the Mechanism and Harmony*

among many others of the like Nature in
Comus, and in *Paradise Lost*.

At every fall smoothing the Raven down —

Hov'ring on Wing, under the Cope of Hell —

Others whose Fruit, burnish'd with golden Rind —

Thro' the pure marble Air, his oblique Way. —

These Lines have been condemned, as not strictly Verse. There is more Harmony, however, in their Versification, notwithstanding their Breach of the Couplet Measure, than in ten Thousand others which might be mentioned, wherein that Measure is most scrupulously preserved. That the Shortness of the Periods, or Intervals between the natural Pauses, really form, in a great Degree, poetic Measures, is farther evident, from the poetical Turn which we find in all Writings of this Kind, where the Style is any Degree elevated above the Terms of common Discourse. Thus, it is the quick Succession of a few flowing Syllables that constitutes the Harmony of our English blank Verse, and not its perfect Coincidence with the arbitrary Rules laid down as a Standard for heroic Verse.

It

It hath been made sufficiently apparent, that a Pause may be made in any Part of the Line in Blank-Verse when the Sense requires it, without Injury to the Versification. Blank-Verse, therefore, does not consist in Lines of ten Syllables, as the regular Couplet generally does; unless, indeed, we suppose the Standard of Verse erected in the Printing-House, and that a Compositor can convert Prose into Verse at Pleasure, by printing it in detached Lines of ten Syllables.

The natural Modulation of the Voice in Speaking and Reading, will hardly ever admit, as before observed, of our pronouncing ten Syllables without making a Pause; but all artificial Pauses are destructive of true Harmony. Hence it is, that every Line of ten or more Syllables must be composed of more than one poetic Period; call it a Foot, Measure, a Verse, or what we will. Now it would be just as absurd, to suppose a Verse to end in the Middle of a Foot or Measure, as to suppose a Sentence to end in the Middle of a Word.

It would be with Propriety, therefore, that Verses without Rhime were written

N

and

and printed of different Lengths, agreeable to their respective Pauses and Measures, the Line always ending with a Stop in the Sense, rather than as they are now printed, with the Sense running into one another.

At least, I am certain, it would be of great Use to common Readers; who are apt to pause at the End of a Line in reciting Verse, whether the Sense will admit of it or no.

The following Lines, among many Hundred others of the like Nature, in Paradise Lost, may serve to illustrate what I mean in this Particular.

— on the eastern Cliff of Paradise

He lights, and to his proper Shape returns

A Seraph wing'd: Six Wings he wore, to shade

His Lineaments divine; the Pair that clad

Each Shoulder broad, came mantling o'er his Breast

With regal Ornament; the middle Pair

Girt like a starry Zone his Waist, and round

Skirted his Loins and Thighs with downy Gold

And Colours dipt in Heaven; the third his Feet

Shadow'd from either Heel, with feather'd Mail,

Sky tinctur'd Grain. Like Maia's Son he stood

And shook his Plumes, that heavenly Fragrance fill'd

The Circuit wide.

I am persuaded, that the Description contained in the above Lines would appear

pear more obvious to the Generality of Readers, if they were printed in the Manner following; nor do I conceive they would be deprived of any Part of their poetical Beauty.

On the eastern Cliff of Paradise he lights,
And to his proper Shape returns a Seraph wing'd:
Six Wings he wore, to shade his Lineaments divine;
The Pair that clad each Shoulder broad,
Came mantling o'er his Breast with regal Ornament;
The middle Pair girt like a starry Zone his Waist,
And round skirted his Loins and Thighs with downy
Gold

And Colours dipt in Heaven.

The third his Feet shadow'd from either Heel with feather'd Mail,

Sky tinctur'd Grain.

Like Maia's Son he stood and shook his Plumes,

That heavenly Fragrance fill'd the Circuit wide.

It is very common to meet with modern Blank-Verse that would pass universally for Prose, were it not for the Mode in which it is printed: It is not quite so common, on the other hand, to meet with Poetry imposed on us for Prose. In a late Translation of *Gesner's* rural Poems, however, we have an Instance of this Nature; which will shew the Futility of this mechanical Way of distinguishing Verse from

Prose. The first Poem, addressed to Daphne, begins thus :

“ Not of victorious Chiefs distain'd with Blood,
 “ nor Fields of Carnage sings the frolic Muse. Timid
 “ and gentle, from such horrid Scenes, grasping her
 “ slender Flute, she speeds her Flight.”
 “ Led by the Murmurs of refreshing Streams, and
 “ silent Shades of sacred Groves, she strays : Now by
 “ the Brook, whose Banks are lin'd with Reeds ; now
 “ in the Walks, thick shaded o'er with Trees ; tramp-
 “ ling the Flowers : Or now, reclining on the mossy
 “ Bank, she sits at Ease, and meditates the Song.”

Might not the Composer have made Blank-Verse of this, by printing it in the usual Form ?

Not of victorious Chiefs distain'd with Blood,
 Nor Fields of Carnage, sings the frolic Muse.
 Timid and gentle, from such horrid Scenes,
 Grasping her slender Flute, she speeds her Flight.

Led by the Murmurs of refreshing Streams,
 And silent Shades of sacred Groves, she strays :
 Now by the Brook, whose Banks are lin'd with Reeds ;
 Now in the Walks, thick shaded o'er with Trees ;
 Trampling the Flowers : —

Or now, reclining on the mossy Bank,
 She sits at Ease, and meditates the Song.

Not that I pretend any Innovation in the present Modes of Writing and Printing to be either actually expedient or advisable ; these Examples, however, may serve

serve to shew the Reader, that the allotting a certain Number of Syllables to a Line in Blank-Verse, is a Practice that contributes very little to its Harmony, and at the same Time deprives it, in a great Measure, of Propriety, especially where the Pauses are varied, and the Uniformity of the Couplet-Measure rejected.

On the whole, it appears that the Harmony of English Verse depends very little, in any Case, on its mechanical Division into Lines, consisting of a certain Number of Syllables; or even on the alternate Succession of Syllables of different Lengths; the ancient Measures being as inapplicable to the Harmony of modern Poetry, as the Mechanism of the latter is to poetical Harmony in general. It is, indeed, not easy to reduce the Mechanism of English Verse to such positive Rules, as might determine exactly the Number of Syllables to be admitted in a Foot or Measure; this Number, as well as the Melody of the Verse, depending on the Facility with which such Syllables succeed each other. Thus the Words of a Greek or Latin Verse might, in many Cases, be totally transposed; yet if the Number and Order of

the Feet remained the same, the Verse might still be supposed equally good, tho' the Order of the Succession of hard and soft, harsh and smooth Sounds, should be entirely varied.

In English, however, the Case is different; and Syllables will no more indiscriminately follow each other in the Composition of Metre, even where the Sense might admit of it, than such Metre will admit of more than a small Number of Syllables. It is not enough, that the Intervals of the Sense should be *short*, the Words composing those Intervals should also follow one another smoothly and easily. In other Words, their Sounds should rather *flow into* than *succeed* each other.

We have, indeed, Instances of Prose written in so numerous and flowing a Style, as to pass for Verse, were it not for the Length of the Periods or Intervals above-mentioned. Numerous Examples of this Kind are to be met with in *Hervy's Meditations*, and many other florid Performances of the like Nature, that have appeared of late Years.

On the other hand again, the Periods may be sometimes too short to *flow*; when they

they are as unfit for Verse, as if they were too long. Examples enough of both, are to be met with, in *Dr. Young's Night Thoughts*, and other declamatory Productions.

Having thus taken a cursory View of the several Points, most worthy the Attention of the Reader, in regard to the mere *vocal* Part of Speech, I shall defer the further Illustration of their Influence on the Utterance of written Language, till I have separately considered the *sentimental* Part of Speech, or the natural Relations and Connections of Sense with Sound.

C H A P. III.

Of the sentimental or significant Part of Speech, with the natural and artificial Relations and Connections of Sense and Sound.

SECT. I. *Of the general Resemblance between Sense and Sound, in Speaking or Reading.*

MUCH hath been advanced, and that by very eminent Writers, in favour of the Resemblance between Sense and Sound, or the Art of making the latter an Imitation of the former.

The noble Author, so frequently mentioned in the foregoing Pages, makes the following Observations on this Subject.

“ The only general Rule that can be
 “ given for directing the Pronunciation,
 “ is to sound the Words in such a Manner
 “ as to imitate the Things they signify.
 “ The Words which make the greatest
 “ Figure ought to be expressed with a
 “ peculiar Emphasis : In expressing an
 “ elevated

“ elevated Subject, the Voice ought to be
“ raised above its ordinary Pitch ; and
“ Words signifying Dejection of Mind,
“ ought to be pronounced in a low Note :
“ A Succession of Sounds gradually ascend-
“ ing from low to high Notes, repre-
“ sents an ascending Series of Objects :
“ An opposite Succession of Sounds, is fit-
“ ted for Objects or Sentiments that de-
“ scend gradually : In Dryden’s Ode of
“ Alexander’s Feast, the Line *fal’n, fal’n,*
“ *fal’n, fal’n,* ought to be pronounced with
“ a falling Voice ; and is pronounced in
“ that Manner by every one of Taste,
“ without Instruction †.”

We are farther repeatedly told, by the same Writer, a few Lines after, that “ the
“ Art of pronouncing with Propriety and
“ Grace, being calculated to make the
“ Sound an Echo to the Sense, scarce ad-
“ mits of any other general Rule than
“ that above-mentioned.” In Reply, however, to these Observations, it may be remarked, that the Art of pronouncing with Propriety and Grace, is calculated to much more general and comprehensive

† See Elements of Criticism, Vol. ii. p. 363.

Purposes, than merely that of making the Sound an Echo to the Sense. Indeed, the Rule laid down by his Lordship (*viz.* to found the Words in such a Manner as to imitate the Things they signify) is much too vague and indefinite.

There are very few Objects or Affections that bear any Resemblance to Sounds, nor can therefore be at all imitated in the Pronunciation of the Words expressing them. As to the Qualities which they possess in common with Sound, so far indeed they are imitative; as in their Harshness, Smoothness, Strength, Weakness, Swiftneſs, Slowneſs, &c. But even here, it is the *general Sense* of the Sentence, and not the Meaning of particular Words, which is to guide the Pronunciation in Speaking and in Reading.

Hence, though I agree with this elegant Writer, that “ a Period ought to be pronounced slow, when it expresses what is solemn and deliberate; and ought to be pronounced quick, when it expresses any Thing brisk, lively and impetuous;” yet I cannot by any Means subscribe to his Opinion in the particular Instance he adduces.

It

It is, indeed, curious and entertaining enough to see a Mime in a Burletta varying his Features, Voice and Attitudes, every Moment at the fantastical Changes and Cadences of the Music; but in Speaking or Reading, such a quick Variation of Tones would appear ridiculous and affected; as it would render such Oration or Lecture confused and unintelligible. That Words of the greatest Importance in a Sentence, should be uttered with a peculiar Emphasis, is very certain; but Emphasis denotes Energy and Force, which are as compatible with a grave as an acute Sound; the lowest Note in the Gamut being as emphatical as the highest.

That an *elevated Subject* should be expressed with an *elevated Voice*, may also, in some Species of Elevation *, be reasonable enough; but if the Rule should be adopted by which particular *Words*, signifying Dejection or Depression, should

* The Term *elevated* is here very equivocal. There are doubtless many very sublime Passages, if we regard the Sentiment only, which it might be improper to recite in a high Key. A Period may be very *elevated*, yet very *grave* and *solemn*; and therefore very improperly recited in a shrill or high Tone of Voice.

be always pronounced in a *low Note*, and *vice versa*, the Reader might be subjected to a greater Variety of Notes than the Singer, without having the Advantage of his Melody; which would make strange Work of mere Recitation. As to the Instance given from Alexander's Feast, I should like to know whether his Lordship would have that Line pronounced thus,



Fallen, Fallen, Fallen, Fallen.

If he would, I may safely appeal to any Person that hath an Ear, whether the palpable Affectation of such a Method of pronouncing it, would not defeat the Intention of such Imitation.

It is very justly observed by Mr. Webb *, that the Rule of Criticism respecting the Sound seeming an Echo to the Sense, " must not be understood too literally. " The Sound, says he, should, indeed, " be always in Accord with the Sense; " but they should accompany, not mimic " it. As the Movements of a good Dancer

* Remarks on the Beauties of Poetry, Page 52.

" are

“ are governed by the Music, so the
“ Music of the Verse should be go-
“ verned by the Idea : But, the Nature of
“ Language will not admit of a constant
“ Correspondence.” Hence, this Writer
calls the Imitation of the Rumbling of
Drums, in the following Passage from Dry-
den, altogether ridiculous.

The double, double, double Beat
Of the thund'ring Drum
Cries, Hark ! the Foes come.

My Lord Kaimes appears to have a much
more respectable Idea of this Affinity be-
tween Sense and Sound ; having quoted a
Number of Passages from the Poets, in
order to manifest its Beauty. Certain,
however, it is, that it is frequently very
fanciful and imaginary. There is a cele-
brated Passage in Pope's Essay on Criti-
cism, which hath been long quoted and
requoted as an happy Instance of the Simi-
litude in Question. A very judicious Cri-
tic * hath, nevertheless, very lately called
in Question, and confuted the general
Opinion in this Particular ; and hath

* Mr. S. Johnson.

in a great Degree verified the Proverb : which, as it is homely and may easily suggest itself, need not be repeated.

And yet we find this Point much insisted on in the Elements of Criticism, and laboured with a mechanical Minuteness. I cannot help differing, however, from this Author, with the ingenious Critic last mentioned, and think that the Sound of

Flies o'er th' unbending Corn, and skims along the Main,

bears no Similitude whatever to Rapidity of Motion, however we may suppose it prolonged. Indeed, the *Prolongation* of a rapid Motion is a Kind of contradictory Expression : For though, it be true that a Motion may be actually continued, be its Velocity what it will, yet a swift Motion cannot be apparently so, without a seeming Diminution of its Rapidity.

Again, we conceive the Author of the Elements somewhat singular in his accounting for the Effects of certain Imitations of this Kind. Thus he tells us, that a long Syllable made short, or a short Syllable made long, raises, by the Difficulty of pronouncing contrary to Custom, a Feeling similar to that of hard Labour ;

as an Instance of which, he gives the following Lines of Pope.

When Ajax strives some Rocks *vast* Weight to throw,
The Line too labours, and the Words move flow.

Now I conceive it extremely problematical whether Mr. Pope intended to convey the Sensation here hinted at, in the Word *vast* in the first Line. But be this as it will, the Liberty he took in making a long Syllable short in this Place, hath been frequently imitated by succeeding Writers, who were very far from having any such Intention.

Shield me kind Dryads in this safe retreat
Where Osiers mark the *cool* Waves lucid Way. —

What Time on Arrow's osier'd Bank reclin'd
I to the *pale* Moon pour'd the plaintive Lay. —

Yet not this *cold* Heart ean remain unmov'd
When thy sweet Numbers strike the raptur'd Ear.

It is sure impossible for us to conceive the Author of the above Verses, designed to convey any Sensation similar to that of hard Labour in the poetical Licence here instanced; and of which Practice we have numerous Examples, even to a Degree of Affecta-

Affectation, in the Writings of our modern minor Poets †.

But, though it should not be admitted, that the general Resemblance between Sound and Signification, is so chimerical as I have Reason to think it is, I presume, what hath been already said, is sufficient to shew the Necessity of a more certain Rule for directing our Pronunciation, than the above-mentioned vague and indefinite one of imitating the Sense.

The chief End of Speech is to *inform* the Mind of the Hearer; that of engaging the Ear with fanciful Modes of Sound or Expression, is a subordinate one. Propriety is, indeed, sometimes unattended by Elegance; but Elegance cannot subsist without Propriety. It would be highly absurd, therefore, to make the obvious Standard of the one depend on any imaginary Criterion of the other.

† As a Proof of this, the Reader need only turn to the late Elegies of Mason, Langhorne, and Others.

SECT. II. *Of the Difference between spoken and written Language, and the true Criterion of simple Pronunciation.*

Having rejected the Resemblance between Sense and Sound, as a Rule to direct the Pronunciation in Speaking or Reading in general; it will hardly be imagined I should contend for any Similitude between the Sound and Signification of particular Words.

That a fertile Imagination may find some faint Traces of such a Connection, among the radical Words of most Languages, I will not dispute; it is sufficient, however, for the present Purpose, to suppose the Meaning annexed to particular Words altogether arbitrary; or rather, that the Sounds adapted to express our Ideas, are purely conventional, and bear no natural Relation, Resemblance or Affinity whatever to such Ideas, or to the Objects they express.

In the same Manner, I suppose the Types or Marks of written Language to be equally arbitrary, and to have as little natural Relation, Resemblance or Affinity

to the Ideas or Objects they serve to represent.

Now the Art of Reading, being in fact the Art of converting *Writing* into *Speech*, the Relation which the *living Voice* bears to the *dead Letter*, becomes a very peculiar Object of the Reader's Attention.

This Relation, again, I consider to be just as arbitrary and conventional as that between articulate Sounds and the Ideas expressed by them; or as that between written Types and their correspondent Ideas and Objects. At least, I know of no operating Cause in Nature that originally prevented the Sound adapted to the Letter *a* from being given to the Letter *e*, and *vice versa*. Nay, it is not only certain that different Nations do not apply the same Sounds to the same Letters, but that even the same People diversify those Sounds, at different Times, Places and Occasions. It is hence manifest that *Custom* alone is the Criterion of Pronunciation, as far as it regards particular Words, or the adopting of articulate Voices to distinct Syllables. Again, of Customs, that is the most acknowledged Standard, which is adopted by the Learned and

and polished Speakers of any Age or Nation, residing in the Metropolis of their respective Countries. As it is not my Design, however, to treat here of the Pronunciation of any particular Tongue, this Remark may be considered as digressional.

With regard to the Difference between spoken and written Language, it may, nevertheless, be not improper to observe, that the latter, having greatly the Advantage in Point of Universality, every Concession, in disputable or indifferent Cases, should be made to it by the former: In order, if possible, to effect a Conciliation of the different Dialects and provincial Modes of Utterance, common to all known Languages.

There is another Advantage also, which Writing hath over Speaking; and that is, Precision. What is spoken may be more nervous and affecting, but it is never so exact and intelligible as what is written. It is the Province of the Reader to unite both these Advantages, and give the Energy of the living Voice to the Precision of the dead Letter. This is principally effected by a due Observation of Emphasis, or that Management of the Voice,

by which a due Quantity of Sound is given to every Word and Syllable in a Sentence, in Proportion to its Importance and Significancy.

SECT. III. *Of the Nature and Use of Emphasis in general.*

As Modulation, or a Diversification of Sounds, is necessary to intelligible Pronunciation in general, so Emphasis is necessary to the intelligible Pronunciation of every Discourse or Sentence in particular; it being possible to express very different Meanings by the same Words: So that the Precision of spoken Language is very different from the most correct grammatical Construction of written Words.

Hence the great Advantages which living Speech hath over the dead Letter on the one hand, and the Disadvantages it lies under on the other. Its Advantages are, that we can express much more significantly what we mean, by Speech, than by Writing; its Disadvantages are, that others may misrepresent what is written by artful and fallacious Modes of Repetition. Every Art, however, that may be put
to

to Use is subject to Abuse ; and it is not the Business of a Professor, in teaching the former, to answer for the Consequences of the latter.

Next to the Pronunciation of Words, agreeable to the politest and best Mode of Sound and Accentuation, it behoves the Reader to study the Use of Emphasis. The first is necessary to make his Speech in general understood by polite Hearers, and the latter to make his Discourse or Lecture understood particularly by every one that pays him Attention.

There are, as before observed, two capital Points to be regarded in speaking and reading : These are *Propriety* and *Energy*.

In respect to the former ; the grammatical Construction of the Words made use of, is *first* to be considered, and the Importance of each Word in the Sentence spoken : Next to this, the Relation which the Sentence immediately read or spoken, bears to the Context or Conversation.

Thus we will suppose I mean to say, *I intend to go to London*. It is plain that as my first Consideration in Writing would be the Order of the Words and the grammatical

Construction of the Sentence ; I should not write *I intends to go to London* ; or *Intend I to goes to London* : So in speaking or reading that Sentence, I should not say thus, *I intend to go to London*. But laying the Stress on the most important Words in the Sentence, indicating the Intention specified, I should say *I INTEND to GO to LONDON*. Again, if nothing had been previously said upon the Subject, and consequently nothing more meant by such Sentence than to indicate my Intention of going to London, the Manner of speaking it would be, as above cited, obvious and simple. But if the Conversation had before turned upon my going to *York*, the Antithesis must be marked in the Pronunciation, the Words remaining still the same ; thus, *I intend to go to LONDON*. Which emphatical Mode of speaking would answer the same End, as if I had also added, *not to York*.

Again, if Mention had been made of some other Person's going to *London*, and my Intention was thus indicated as a similar one to his own, the Sentence would be pronounced thus, *I intend to go to London*. As much as to say *I also*, or
I, as

I, as well as you. Farther, if it had been said that the other Person was to go to *York*, the Emphasis would be laid thus, *I intend to go to LONDON.* Thus we see that the Connection of one Sentence with the rest, or the Sense of the Context, determines the particular Sense of every Sentence in the Discourse.

This Connection is so obvious and important, that almost all Writers on this Subject, have looked upon it as the only Circumstance essential to reading and speaking: The separate Sense of each Sentence, though a primary Consideration, being overlooked or perverted. It is, however, absurd to suppose, that the Influence which one Sentence hath over another by Connection, should totally pervert the natural and obvious Meaning of a Sentence separately considered. Yet this is often found to be the Case; particularly in the Declamations of our Comedians, who are too ignorant or fantastical to attend to the true Meaning of their Author; and in those of many of our popular Preachers, who are fond of wresting the Words of a Text from its natural and

obvious Meaning, to some other farther-fetched and more mystical.

Again, those Declaimers, who study Elegance before Propriety, and are for repeating every thing emphatically, as they call it, are perpetually running into this Error, and adapting Meanings to Words, which their natural Construction will by no Means bear. I have heard some of these would-be Orators read a Paragraph in the News-Papers, with the same emphatical Tone and Manner as they would have rehearsed a Speech in Macbeth or Othello: With what Propriety my Readers will judge. I will not deny that a Reader may sometimes improve on the Sense of the Writer by emphatical Expression, as a Translator may sometimes correct and improve his Original; but I would have Readers in general be very cautious of attempting this. The Genius of a Garrick, indeed, may be allowed now and then to break through all Rules, and, as the Poet says,

Snatch a Grace beyond the Reach of Art.

It would perhaps be better, however, if he himself had not done it too frequently.

quently. In that famous Passage from Shakespear,

Draw, Archers ; draw your Arrows to the head,

It is supposed the Poet wrote them as above, with a View to the Actor's pausing after the Word *Archers*. Mr. Garrick, I think, is said to pronounce them thus,

Draw, Archers, draw ;—your Arrows to the Head.

Nothing surely can be more evident to a Reader of Taste and Sensibility, than that if the Actor hath here varied from the Poet, he hath done it with great Propriety and Success; the Line, as it first stands, being exceedingly tame and frigid; whereas in the last Method it glows with all that Spirit and Fire, with which the Hero is supposed to be agitated.

These are Liberties, however, which I say again, inferior Geniusses must not presume to take; the plain grammatical Construction of each Sentence, being the first Thing to be considered, in all Kinds of Reading or Speaking whatever; for this, though it may be farther heightened and animated by the Connection of the Sentence with the Context; yet we may be certain, that whenever this Connection trespasses too far on the natural and obvious
Meaning

Meaning of the Words considered by themselves, that Connection is not real, but imaginary.

Now, though Emphasis is graceful, is elegant, when founded on *Propriety*, nothing can render a Speaker more absurd and ridiculous than his falling into Errors in this Particular; as, in so doing, he does still worse than render himself unintelligible; since he either speaks what he does not mean, or misrepresents the Meaning of an Author, for want of knowing how to repeat what he hath written.

This Abuse of Emphasis is so general, that I cannot help giving a remarkable Instance or two of it, from the Lectures of a celebrated Professor of Elocution, who lately figured in the Metropolis and Universities of Great Britain and Ireland.

SECT. IV. *Of the Abuse of Emphasis.*

Mr. Sheridan, in his Lecture on Emphasis, hath taken some Pains to set the Clergy right in their Delivery of the Church Service. Unhappily, however, his Inattention to the simple Construction of the Passages he mentions, and his hunt-
ing

ing after hidden Meanings, have led him into as great Errors, as those he endeavours to correct. The Fact, indeed, hath been taken Notice of by the Authors of, the Monthly Review; who have passed some severe Animadversions on the Professor's Mistakes: As they do not enter, however, very particularly into the Source of such Errors, and as the Justice of their Strictures on this Head has been called in Question by some, who possibly might not see into their Motives of Censure, I shall endeavour to set these Mistakes in a clearer Light, by giving more particular Reasons why I cannot help subscribing to the Opinion of those ingenious Critics, in their Reprehensions of Mr. Sheridan's Manner of emphasizing the Passages in Dispute.

The first Passage mentioned by the Lecturer, is this: *Enter not into Judgment with thy Servant, O Lord, for in thy Sight shall no Man living be justified.* Here, says Mr. Sheridan, " the Words
" *not, Servant, Sight, justified,* between
" which it is impossible to find out any
" Connection, or Dependance of one on
" the other, are principally marked.
" By

“ By these false Emphases, the Mind is
 “ turned wholly from the main Purport
 “ and Drift of the Verse. Upon hearing
 “ an Emphasis on the Particle *not*, it
 “ expects quite another Conclusion to
 “ make the Meaning consistent; and in-
 “ stead of the Particle *for*, which begins
 “ the latter Part of the Sentence, it would
 “ expect a *but*; as, *Enter not into Judgment*
 “ *with thy Servant, O Lord, but regard me*
 “ *with an Eye of Mercy*. When it hears the
 “ Emphasis on *Servant*, it expects another
 “ Conclusion; as, *Enter not into Judgment*
 “ *with thy Servant, O Lord, but enter into*
 “ *Judgment with those who are not thy Ser-*
 “ *vants*. The same also will be found in
 “ the Emphases on the Words *Sight* and
 “ *justified*. So that the Sentence will seem
 “ to point at several different Meanings,
 “ and to have no Consistency. But if it
 “ be read in the following Manner, the
 “ Meaning and Connection will be ob-
 “ vious. *Enter not into Judgment with*
 “ *thy Servant O Lord for in thy Sight,*
 “ *shall no Man living be justified*. Here
 “ we see the whole Meaning is obvious,
 “ and that there is a great deal more
 “ implied,

“ implied, than the mere Words could
 “ express, without the Aid of proper Em-
 “ phases. *Enter not into Judgment with*
 “ *thy Servant, O Lord—That is, enter not,*
 “ *O Lord, into the Severity of Judgment with*
 “ *thy Creature,—For in thy Sight,—which*
 “ *is all-piercing, and can spy the smallest*
 “ *Blemish—shall no Man living be justified*
 “ *—No Man on Earth, no not the best shall*
 “ *be found perfect, or sufficiently pure, to*
 “ *stand the Examination of the Eye of Purity*
 “ *itself.—For in thy Sight shall no Man*
 “ *living be justified.*”

The Animadversions of the Reviewers on these Remarks of Mr. Sheridan are rather ludicrous than otherwise. “ To
 “ copy the Lecturer’s Manner of Criti-
 “ cism, say they, might we not ask him,
 “ if his laying the Emphasis on the Word
 “ *living* in this Passage, does not seem to
 “ intimate that *dead* Men may be justified
 “ though the *living* shall not? Yet this
 “ surely cannot be the Sense of the Pas-
 “ sage. The Word *living* is here used as
 “ a phraseological and unmeaning Term;
 “ and had the Verse ran thus, *For in thy*
 “ *Sight shall no Man be justified,* the Sense
 “ of

“ of it would have been the same; and
 “ can Mr. Sheridan pretend that the Em-
 “ phasis, which only, according to him,
 “ gives Sense and Meaning to the whole
 “ Sentence, should be laid upon a Word
 “ merely expletive?”

This severe Manner of criticising may possibly disgust the more candid Reader; It is nevertheless certain, that there is a great deal of Truth couched under this ludicrous Severity. If the Reviewer, however, had called the Word *living* an emphatical or energetic Term, rather than a phraseological *unmeaning* one, he would have been nearer the Truth. It is true, that it does not add any thing but Energy to the Sense; the Meaning of the Sentence being the same, whether it be inserted or omitted: but it is to be observed, that the great Use of all phraseological Expression is Energy; the Term, therefore, is not *unmeaning* or useless, although nothing can be more absurd than Mr. Sheridan's laying the Emphasis upon *living*, when he puts none on the Word *Man*. The Meaning is plain, *no living Man, no Man alive, not any Man whatever*; now though this may be expressed, as the Critic says,

says, by *no Man*, it would not be expressed so emphatically.

To express a Thing emphatically, however, we must not follow the Rule here practised of laying an exclusive Stress upon the Words introduced to give Energy to the Expression; their Introduction only serving to strengthen the Stress of the Voice laid upon the right Words, and these are the same whether any such Words be introduced or not. Thus, whether it be said *No Man shall be justified*, or *No Man living shall be justified*, the emphatical Words are *no* and *Man*.

Mr. Sheridan is, indeed, as much mistaken with Regard to *Emphasis*, as I have already shewn him to be with respect to *Accent*. Words, he says, are solely constituted, or distinguished from mere Collections of Syllables, by *Accent*: in like Manner, he tells us, that it is *Emphasis* which only gives Sense and Meaning to Sentences. But supposing *Emphasis* to be, what he seems to think it, viz. a Method of laying a greater Stress upon some Words in a Sentence than on others, nothing is more certain, than that there are some Sentences so extremely simple and unemphatical,

phatical, as to require no Difference whatever in the forcible Pronunciation of the Words. Will it be said, that these Sentences have no Meaning?

There is a general Meaning in every Sentence grammatically written or spoken, and which must always be considered antecedent to the particular Meaning given it by Emphasis; nor can these possibly be contrary to each other, how particular soever may be the Turn which the latter may give to the other. A material Substance may be modified into a Variety of Forms; but those Forms must be consistent with the Nature of the Substance; nor can it with any Propriety be said, that the mere Form of a Thing gives Being and Consistence to it.

If Emphasis only gives Sense and Meaning to Sentences, I should be glad to know of what Use is grammatical Construction. I rather believe, important as Emphasis allowedly is to intelligible and elegant Pronunciation, that false Concords would be less intelligible of the two, if not more inelegant, than false Emphases.

This being the Case; the articulate Pronunciation of every Word in a Sentence

tence is the Basis of all Speech ; and no Stress or Emphasis should be laid on any particular Word in any Sentence, without a due Regard to the general Meaning of the whole, and of the just Pronunciation of every Word in that Sentence.

It is for want of paying this due Regard to every single Word in a Sentence, that many not inelegant, but precipitate Readers, frequently repeat to others, many Passages whose Meaning they do not above half understand.

Nothing is so common as this Way of *half-reading*, especially in the Works of such Authors, as have a sententious or laconic Mode of Expression.

The next Instance Mr. Sheridan gives of the Abuse of Emphasis, is in reading the following Passage from the first Epistle of St. John.

“ If we *say* that we have no *Sin*, we
“ deceive *ourselves*, and the Truth is not *in*
“ us ; but if we confess our Sins, He is
“ faithful and just to forgive us our *Sins*,
“ and to cleanse us from all *Unrighteous-*
“ *ness*.”

P

This

This Verse, we are told, is usually pronounced as above emphasized; on which Mr. Sheridan makes the following Observations.

" If we say that we have no Sin—Here,
" by laying the strong Emphasis on the
" Word say, we are led to a wrong Mean-
" ing, as if we only said it with our
" Lips, but did not think so. How then
" can the Conclusion follow of deceiving
" ourselves? We may deceive others by
" saying what is false; but it is only by
" thinking falsely we can deceive our-
" selves, which is the true Meaning of
*" the Words properly pronounced. *If**
*" *we say that we have no Sin, we deceive**
*" *ourselves—That is, If there be any amongst**
*" *us so vainly blind to their own Faults, as**
*" *to imagine they are without Sin, they de-**
*" *ceive themselves. This Sentence is not**
*" *an affirmative one, but conditional. It**
*" *does not say that there are any such**
*" *amongst us, but, If there be any such;**
*" *and therefore the conditional Particle**
*" *If, is in this Case emphatical."**

The Critics above-mentioned have equally censured these Remarks with those

those on the former Passage; they content themselves, however, with calling them quaint and puerile; and the Reasons given for removing the Emphasis from *say* to *if* far-fetched and groundless.

It is very apparent, indeed, that if Mr. Sheridan hath not mistaken the Meaning in the Verse above quoted, he has invented a Blunder, which would require some Ingenuity and Sagacity for any body to fall into. It does not at all appear from the Context that St. John had any View to deceiving *others* by a *verbal* Confession of their Sins; nor could any Reader, tolerably versed in the English Tongue, be naturally led to the wrong Meaning here pointed out, from the Use of the Word *say*; that Verb being used not only to signify oral Utterance, but to allege, relate, or tell in any Manner whatever. Thus, in the following Lines, a Letter is supposed to *say* a Message.

With flying Speed, and seeming great Pretence,
Came Messenger with Letters which his Message *said*.

Spenser's Fairy Queen.

Indeed this Use of the Word *say* is so common, that Authorities are entirely needless: And that no Reader, who did

not seek for latent and studied Meanings, could possibly fall into the Error supposed, will be obvious to every one who will give the preceding Verses of the Chapter an unprejudiced and impartial Reading. That the Sentence is not affirmative, but conditional, is admitted, and that therefore the Particle *if* should be in a Degree emphatical, is certain; but then it should be in that Degree in which Particles can be emphatical at all; and not so as to exclude the Emphasis which should be laid on the Verb, expressing the very Action on which the Condition depends.

Let us suppose the Word *allege* made use of instead of *say*, which might have been done with great Propriety.

We should then read *If we allege that we have no Sin*: This is the Condition, *alleging we are without Sin*. Now can it be reasonably pretended that any Emphasis, placed on the Particle *if*, which connects this conditional Part of the Sentence with the subsequent affirmative Part, renders it unnecessary to lay a Stress on the Terms expressing the Condition itself? Surely not! When Mr. Sheridan, therefore, reads that Sentence thus, “ If we
say

“say that we have *no Sin*, we deceive our-
“*selves*,” he is undoubtedly egregiously
mistaken.

This Mistake also is evidently owing
to the above-mentioned Cause, his Neglect
to take in the Importance of the several
Words as they stand in the grammatical
Construction of the Sentence.

For my own Part, I cannot easily form
a Sentence in which the Particle *if* can
require any very considerable Degree of
Emphasis, unless the Terms of the Con-
dition are understood and not expressed;
where it stands alone to form a Sentence
of itself.

Mr. Sheridan falls into a similar Error,
with respect to the Particle *but*, in the
Beginning of the next Verse. I shall
give the Reader his whole Remarks, how-
ever, on this Passage.

“If we say that we have *no Sin*, we
“*deceive ourselves*—and the *Truth* is not in
“*us*. Here is another Fault committed in
“laying the Emphasis on the Words *in*
“*us* only, whilst the Word *Truth*, which
“is the important one, is slightly passed
“over. And the *Truth* is not *in us*. That

“ is, the Opinion entertained of ourselves
 “ is false. This strong Emphasis laid
 “ only on the Words *in* us, is the more
 “ unpardonable in those who lay such an
 “ Emphasis on the Word *say*, because it
 “ by no means follows that the Truth is
 “ not in us, because we say otherwise;
 “ a Man may think the Truth, and say
 “ the contrary; and this very Phrase
 “ proves the Meaning of the Text as
 “ before explained, that it relates to
 “ thinking, not saying; as it expressly
 “ *says* * the *Truth* is not *in* us, that is, we
 “ *think* falsely.”

“ But if we confess our *Sins*—Here
 “ again the false Emphasis is laid on the
 “ Word *Sins*, whilst the principal Cir-
 “ cumstance, that of *confessing* our Sins,
 “ is slightly passed over. But if we *confess*
 “ our Sins,—that is, if upon a thorough
 “ Self-Examination, after having disco-
 “ vered our Sins, we make an humble
 “ Acknowledgement of them, with a con-

* Is it not very extraordinary that this Writer should
 so strongly insist that *saying* here is so liable to be understood
 in its strictest Sense, as of something said with the Lips,
 when he himself makes Use of it in a figurative Sense, even
 in the Illustration of his Argument?

“ trite

“trite Heart, filled with Penitence, and
 “a thorough Desire and Intention of per-
 “forming; (for all this is implied in the
 “Word *confess*, as no other Sort of Con-
 “fession can be of Avail towards obtain-
 “ing the consequential Grace promised
 “from it.) How emphatical, therefore,
 “ought this Word to be which implies
 “so much!”

Undoubtedly the Word *confessed* ought to be very emphatically pronounced; but then I cannot help joining Issue again with the Reviewers, that a similar Motive should have induced him to lay a strong Emphasis on the Verb *say* in the first Part of the Sentence. For to *say* we have no *Sin*, is to *deny* that we have *Sin*, and this *denying* in the first Part of the Sentence, is immediately opposed to *confessing* in the latter, and should certainly be pronounced emphatically to mark the Antithesis.

Again, the very same Reason which should induce Mr. Sheridan to place an Emphasis on *if* in the first Part of the Sentence, should, as the Reviewers very justly observe, have induced him to place a similar one on the same Particle in the

second Part, as it is equally emphatical in both.

“ There is another Word in this Sentence, continues Mr. Sheridan, which is hurried over, as if it were a mere Particle, when in this Place it is a Word of strong Import ; I mean the Word *but*. It is usually read,—*Büt* if we confess our Sins,—as if it were a mere disjunctive Particle. Whereas *but* in this Situation stands in the Place of the Words, *On the other Hand*, as may be seen by reading the two Members of the Sentence, and uniting them by these Words.”—*But*, therefore, we are told, standing in the Place of Words, should be made emphatical, as all Particles are when they are substituted in the Place of Words.

Not, however, more emphatical, I should think, than the Words for which they are substituted. Let us change the Particle for the Words then, and see what Emphasis could, with any Propriety, be here placed on them, and of what *strong Import* they are in the Sentence. I do not see that, *on the other hand*, any more than *but*, is any thing else than the mere *formal Part* of the Antithesis. The Meaning of
the

the Sentence would be exactly the same, if both were omitted; the whole Design of the Writer being to say that, *If we deny our Sins, we deceive ourselves, and if we confess our Sins, they will be forgiven us.* So that though a Conjunction copulative might not have been so elegant and oratorical as a disjunctive one, it is evidently as important*.

Again, it is observable that while Mr. Sheridan is so very earnest about the Consequence of his *ifs* and *buts*, he forgets to lay an Emphasis on the Word *deceive*, an important Word undoubtedly, as it expresses the Action consequential on the conditional one.

As to what is alleged, by the way, concerning the Nature of the Confession, it is entirely foreign to the Purpose of enforcing the Emphasis. Of the same Nature is the Remark immediately following; wherein the Lecturer recommends a mere declamatory Artifice, calculated rather for the Admiration of the ignorant Vulgar,

Agreeable to this, we find no *but* in the common Translations of the Bible; nor is there any such Particle in the Original; the five last Verses of the Chapter all beginning with *Εάν, si, if.*

than

than Auditors capable of distinguishing what is delivered with Elegance and Propriety. To proceed with my Quotation.

“ *But*, if we confess our *Sins*, He is
“ faithful and just to forgive us our Sins.—
“ Who is faithful and just to forgive us
“ our Sins? Could any one conceive that
“ it is the great God of the Universe,
“ who is here spoken of in so slight a
“ Way. Throughout the whole Service
“ indeed the awful Name of God is
“ treated of so familiarly, and so little
“ distinguished even from any Particle of
“ three Letters, as must give great Of-
“ fence to pious Ears. It is said of the
“ great Robert Boyle, that he never men-
“ tioned the Name of God, even in pri-
“ vate Discourse, without making a per-
“ ceptible Pause after it. How much
“ more would this Practice become those
“ who are engaged in the solemn Act of
“ Public Worship? and how much would
“ it add to the Solemnity of that Wor-
“ ship? In this particular Text, some
“ peculiar Manner of distinguishing the
“ Relative, which stands for the Name
“ of God, is more essentially necessary,
“ because his Name was not before men-
tioned,

tioned, and the Sentence can not even
be made Sense without it. The Pro-
noun *He* should therefore be made
very emphatical, and both be preceded
and succeeded by a perceptible Pause;
at the same time the Eyes should be
devoutly raised towards Heaven, to ex-
plain and enforce by the Look, what is
deficient in the Expression."

I will not take upon me to say, there
are no Clergymen who recite the Passages
in Question, as Mr. Sheridan asserts, or
that the Service of the Church is always
performed with that Decency and Solemnity
the Nature of it requires. I would
also be very far from turning into Ridicule
any Custom or Habit arising from so good
a Motive, as a Veneration for the sacred
Name of our Creator; and still much less
the Example of so great and good a Character
as Mr. Boyle; and yet, I cannot
subscribe to the Propriety of the Pauses
recommended by the Writer; or look
upon them in any other Light than as
mere declamatorial Tricks, Clap-Traps
for the Multitude, which might be practised
perhaps with Success, on the Stage
or at the Tabernacle, but would be altogether

ther too artificial for the Pulpit in our Churches. I can readily conceive that an Auditor of Taste and Judgment would be almost as much pleased to see a Preacher cross himself, as the Papists do, or make a Bow or a Scrape like Catechists in a Country Church, as stop with such affected Pauses every Time he might have Occasion to mention the Name of God.

With Regard to the particular Passage in Question; one is apt to imagine the Lecturer really had not so much as looked at the Context; since he recommends this Method of distinguishing the Pronoun Relative *He*, because the Name of God was not before mentioned. Whereas it was mentioned but a very few Lines before, and the grammatical Construction preserved by the Repetition of Pronouns Personal or Relative, to the very End of the Chapter *.

But

* John, Chap I.

V. 5. This then is the Message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is Light, and in *him* is no Darkness at all.

6. If we *say* that we have Fellowship with *him* and walk in Darkness, we lie, and do not the Truth :

7. But

But I fear the Patience of my Reader will be exhausted by my dwelling so long on this Instance: He will, I presume, readily admit, however, that the Errors of a Public Professor of any Art, as they are more conspicuous and important than those of private Individuals, cannot be too explicitly treated. When Pilots and experienced Navigators are mistaken in their Reckoning, their Blunders ought to be particularly pointed out as a Warning to others, to proceed with greater Attention, or on more certain Principles.

Mr. Sheridan's Misapprehension, with Regard to the Importance of Particles, leads him into still greater Errors than the preceding. "Particles, says he, whenever they are emphatical, change the Meaning of the Words from that which belongs to them as pronounced in the common Way. Thus if we read this

7. But if we walk in the Light, as *he* is in the Light, we have Fellowship one with another, and the Blood of Jesus Christ *his* Son cleanseth us from all Sin.

8. If we *say* that we have no Sin, we deceive ourselves, and the Truth is not in us.

9. If we confess our Sins, *he* is faithful and just to forgive us our Sins, and to cleanse us from all Unrighteousness.

Line

“Line of Othello in the following
“Manner,

Put out the Light, and then, put out the Light;

“It is Nonsense. But by marking the
“Particle *the* in the Repetition of the
“same Words, a new Idea and a new
“Meaning is presented to the Mind.

Put out the Light, and then put out *the* Light.

“That is, the Light of Life, put in Op-
“position, by Force of this Emphasis, to
“the Light of the Candle.”

In remarking on this pretended Cor-
rection, I shall beg Leave to make Use of
the Words of the Monthly Critics before-
mentioned, as my Opinion is so perfectly
conformable to theirs in this Particular.
This Observation, say they, “is extreme-
“ly puerile, and had come with greater
“Propriety from an illiterate Member of
“the *Spouting Club*, than from a cele-
“brated Professor of Elocution. To the
“best of our Remembrance, we have
“heard Mr. Quin do Justice to Shake-
“speare in that Passage by reciting it
“thus;

Put out the Light, and then,—put out the Light!

To

“ To suppose, with Mr. Sheridan, that
“ the Allusion between the Light of the
“ Candle and that of Life, presented itself
“ to the Mind of Othello before he began
“ the Line, is to suppose his Mind sufficiently calm and unembarrassed to talk
“ in Metaphor and Conceit; whereas it
“ is not so unnatural for that Allusion to
“ strike him after he had mentioned putting out the Candle; in which Case nothing can be more natural than for him
“ to pause, and repeating his Words, by
“ way of recollecting what he said, to
“ address the Taper in the moralizing
“ Strain that follows,

If I quench thee, thou flaming Minister,
I can again thy former Light restore
Should I repent. But once quench *thy* Light,
Thou cunning'st Pattern of excelling Nature!
I know not where is that Promethean Heat
That can thy Light relumine.”

The next Instance of this Kind relates to the Particle *and*, and is taken from the following Lines in Tamerlane,

Can'st thou believe thy Prophet, or what's more,
That Power Supreme that made *thee* AND thy Prophet.

Under this Emphasis the Particle *and*, says Mr. Sheridan, is couched the following

ing Meaning, "This Prophet whom thou
 "worshippest, and to whom thou payest
 "chief Honours, was only a Creature like
 "thyself, made by the same Almighty
 "Being, and subject to the same Laws."

Now, though this Meaning may, with
 some Stretch of Thought, be deduced
 from the Emphasis being laid on the Par-
 ticle *and*; yet it does by no Means appear
 that any such Thing was intended to be
 said. On the contrary, I am persuaded,
 that the Poet would have bestowed more
 Words on the Matter, if he had designed
 to say as much, and would not have left it
 to be gathered solely from the Actor's
 placing an artful Emphasis on a Particle.

If we examine, indeed, into the ob-
 vious and simple Meaning of the Words,
 it does not appear that we can deduce any
 thing of this depreciating Quality, be-
 tween Mahomet and the Person addressed,
 as is supposed to be obliquely hinted at,
Canst thou believe thy Prophet, or what's
more, certainly it was not depreciating the
 Prophet to say that God Almighty was
 more or greater: nor was it putting the
 Man and the Prophet upon an equal Foot-
 ing

ing to call God *That Power supreme that made them both.*

We can conceive spiritual Beings of a much superior Nature to ourselves, as Angels, &c. all made by the same Creator with ourselves, and yet not the same Kind of Creatures, nor subject to the same Laws.

The Person spoken to, is not directly censured for believing in his Prophet; on the contrary, that Prophet is spoken of with a Degree of Respect, though infinitely beneath that paid to the Deity, which is exalted as the Author or Creator even of the Prophet as well as of the Man.

On this Circumstance then lies the Stress or emphatical Part of the Sentence. So that, instead of laying the Emphasis solely on the Particle *and*, it should be laid chiefly on the Word *made*, as expressive of that Action, Quality, or creative Power, in which the Superiority mentioned consists: For *and*, hath at best no other Meaning than *also*, or, *as well as*; this is plain by reading the Lines thus,

*Can'st thou believe thy Prophet, or what's more,
That Power Supreme that made thee with thy Prophet also;
Or, Thy Prophet as well as thee.*

Q

The

The Importance of the Particle *and* will totally vanish, and the latent Sense, supposed to be couched under it, appear altogether chimerical, if we diversify the Words thus,

Can'st thou believe thy Prophet, or what's more,
That Power Supreme, which is both thy *Maker* and thy
Prophet's.

I believe I may venture to say, that this and this only, was the Meaning of the Poet; at least this is all the Words will bear, in their obvious and natural Sense; beyond which, every Kind of Meaning, however certainly intended, had better be sunk, as it will appear at best quaint, affected and obscure.

We have a remarkable Instance of this in the last Lines of the celebrated Epitaph of Mr. Pope, on Mr. Gay.

— *The Virtuous and the Good shall say,
Striking their pensive Bosoms—Here lies Gay.*

Mr. Pope is said to have complained, that few Persons entered into the Conceit of Gay's lying interred in the Bosoms of the Good and Virtuous. And yet the Epitaph was admired; at least much more than it hath been since his learned Commentator

mentator informed the World of the reality of this Conceit's being intended.

In this Place there was undoubtedly an Impropriety in the Quaintness of the Turn; which was by no Means adapted to the solemn Nature of that Species of Writing, the Epitaph. In an Epigram it would have had Propriety. Supposing no Impropriety, however, in the Case, the Use of Emphasis will always degenerate into Abuse, if the Reader is anxious, as Mr. Sheridan seems to be, of giving to Words all the Meaning they seem capable of supporting, or that they may be wrested into.

Ease and Simplicity are the chief Requisites in every Art, and particularly in Style and Diction; thus Sentences may be sometimes overcharged with Meaning, as well as be too void of it; and a Reader should ever be cautious of making his Author say *more* than he intended, lest he should pervert his real Intention, and make him say what he never intended at all.

It were paying a very bad Compliment to a good Writer, to suppose he wrote enigmatically, or that it required Labour

and Ingenuity to decipher what he addressed to the common Understandings of Mankind.

Again, it is not uncommon for Writers, who pique themselves on a flowing Stile, or what is called numerous Composition, to make Use of Words, which, with regard to the Sense, are merely expletive; serving no other Purpose than to harmonize the Periods, and give Measure and Rotundity to the Sentence.

It is extremely idle for the Reader, in such Cases, to load the Words thus used with an Emphasis, as if they were strongly significant.

In pronouncing the following Line in *Othello*, Mr. Sheridan says, “The peculiar
“Beauty and Force *is* lost, by laying the
“Emphasis on the Verb *love*, instead of
“laying it on the auxiliary Verb *do*.

Perdition catch my Soul but I do love thee :

“Whereas when it is repeated

Perdition catch my Soul but I dō love thee—

“the Emphasis on *dō*, marks the Vehemence of his Affection, much better
“than any Emphasis on the Verb *love*
“could. For when the Emphasis is laid
“on

“ on the Verb *love*, *do* becomes a mere
 “ Expletive, being an unnecessary Sign of
 “ the Present Tense. But when an Em-
 “ phasis is placed on *do*, it becomes an
 “ Auxiliary Verb, signifying an Act of
 “ the strongest Affirmation.”

It is very certain that, as to the Sense of the Line, the Verb *do* is in the former Case merely expletive; but it is not so with Regard to the Measure of the Verse, nor to the Rotundity of the Expression: for how would the Line have run, if written thus,

Perdition catch my Soul but I love thee?

It is to be considered, therefore, whether the Sense be full and compleat without laying any Emphasis on the expletive; and if so, such Emphasis is false and needless, as in the present Case; Othello being made, according to Mr. Sheridan's Manner of Reading, to talk in the infantine Strain of Nurses and young Children*.

To

* The Monthly Reviewers, speaking of this Passage, agree, indeed, with Mr. Sheridan, that an Emphasis should be laid on *do*; but not that it should therefore be quite taken away from *love*: The Auxiliary Verb, say they

To dwell no longer, however, on the imaginary Importance of *ifs*, *buts*, and *ands*, or on the Absurdity of laying a Stress on *Auxiliary* Verbs, to the Exclusion of the *Principal*, we find our Declaimers guilty of as great an Abuse of Emphasis, though a more excusable one, in the extraordinary Stress they are accustomed to lay upon *Epithets*, to the Neglect of the *Noun Substantives* they accompany; just as if the Words importing the Properties or Qualities of Things were of more Importance than those expressive of the Things themselves. Thus, if in saying *I sold an HORSE To-day*, I should clap an additional Piece of Information to the Sentence by Means of the Epithet *black*;

they, hath no Meaning without the Principal had been before mentioned, and were here only understood; which is not the Case. Theatrical Declaimers (continue these Critics) seem not to be sufficiently aware that the Emphasis is frequently required to be continued, with a little Variation, on two, and sometimes three Words together. They might have given a striking Example of this from the Speech of Satan in the fifth Book of Milton's *Paradise Lost*.

— *New Laws thou seest impos'd,*
New LAWS from HIM who REIGNS new MINDS may raise
In us who SERVE, new COUNSELS to debate
What doubtful may ensue.

to

to speak after the vicious Mode of emphasizing, I should lay the Stress upon the Word expressive of the Quality of the Horse, exclusive of the Horse itself; thus, *I sold a BLACK Horse To-day*; as if it had been previously affirmed that I had sold a *white* one.

Whoever is attentive to the Mode of Pronunciation on our Theatres, will find this to be very frequently the Case. Nay, I remember to have heard one of the best Speakers in England, and who is generally accounted to read Milton's *Paradise Lost* in particular better than any other Man in the three Kingdoms, guilty of this Error in reciting the following Passage; which he pronounced thus,

—— Sage he stood
With ATLANTIAN Shoulders fit to bear
The Weight of MIGHTIEST Monarchies.

Laying a strong Emphasis on the Epithets *Atlantean* and *mightiest*, and sinking the Substantives *Shoulders* and *Monarchies*, as if they were merely expletive and insignificant. That both these Epithets are strongly emphatical is very certain; but, unless there is some Antithesis in view, or

the Substantive hath been before mentioned, no Epithet can be emphatical independent of its Substantive. The Sense, indeed, will determine how far the one may be more or less so than the other; as in the Instance before us, where the particular Allusion intended by the Epithet *Atlantean*, and the general Meaning of the Substantive *Shoulders*, shew, that the Stress to be laid on the former should be greater than that on the latter. On the other hand, in the last Line, it is equally clear that the Sense requires a greater Stress to be laid on *Monarchies* than on *mightiest*; the Word *Monarchies* evidently referring to the same Allusion of Atlas's supporting the World.

Thus the Sense and Meaning of this Passage plainly requires it to be recited thus,

Sage he stood
With *ATLANTEAN Shoulders* fit to bear
The Weight of *mightiest MONARCHIES*.

An Error of the same Kind is that, of laying a Stress upon Adverbs, and upon Adjectives used adverbially, to the Neglect of the Verbs on which they depend;

as

as if the Mode of an Action were of more Importance than the Action itself. Thus in saying *he wept bitterly, she sung sweetly, it slept profound*, these mistaken Declaimers would lay the Emphasis solely on the Adverbs and the Adjective; whereas it should be laid also, and that principally, on the Verb. There are Cases indeed wherein the Verb is used metaphorically, and does not strictly express an Action in that literal Sense in which it is generally used. Here the greater Stress should not be laid on the Verb, but on the Adverb. Thus in the following Sentence, *Should a Man sit down to write on such a Subject*, the Verb *sit* does not strictly mean the corporal Act of *sitting*, in Opposition to standing or lying, but the taking up some time, or the attentive Application to write; and thence the Stress should be rather laid upon the Adverb *down*, than on the Verb *sit*.

Again, in the Line last quoted from Milton,

Sage he stood,

The Emphasis should be rather laid upon *sage* than upon *stood*; for though it be true, that Beelzebub is represented in a standing

standing Posture, yet it is not in that particular Position his Capacity to bear the Weight of Monarchies is supposed to depend; but on his mental Strength or Sagacity; as fully appears from the Lines preceding;

With grave

Aspect he rose, and in his rising seem'd
A Pillar of State; deep on his Front engraven
Deliberation sat and public Care;
And princely Counsel in his Face yet shone,
Majestic though in Ruin: Sage he stood, &c.

The Reader will see clearly, from these Examples, that nothing less than a perfect Acquaintance with the Meaning of an Author, can enable any Person to read his Works with Energy and Propriety; the Errors committed by artificial Declaimers being very gross, and of much more Consequence than those of Readers who affect no emphatical Mode of Delivery at all.

If the latter disgust, they seldom mislead; the Purposes of Speaking and Reading also would be even better answered by the barely-intelligible Delivery of the Sense of the Writer, than by a declamatory Mode of Recital, by which
his

his Meaning would be obscured or perverted. The Information of the Mind, and Improvement of the Understanding, is of more Consequence than pleasing the Ear: and though it may be said the latter is necessary to awaken Attention, it is better perhaps such Attention should remain asleep, than be awakened by those Means which may serve to mislead the Judgment.

One might be led to imagine, by the extravagant Manner in which the Importance of Emphasis is treated by some Writers *, that written Language had really no determinate Meaning at all; but that all depended upon the oral Utterance of the Reader: I shall endeavour to shew, however, that the Influence of Emphasis, great as it is, is still subject to the Precision of written Language, and that if Orthography and Syntax do not accompany the Reader's Orthoëpy and Emphasis, his Oratory will have no more Effect than the sounding Brass and the tinkling Cymbol.

* See Sheridan's Lectures.

236 *Of Pause, Cadence, Tone and Gesture.*

SECT. V. *Of Pause, Cadence, Tone, and Gesture.*

Pauses, in Speaking and Reading, are equally necessary both to Grace and Propriety. Their Use is too obvious in both Cases to need much Explanation. Rhetoricians, however, have been greatly perplexed about their Nature and Application. The Abbé Batteux observes, that from the Necessity we lie under of frequently fetching Breath, we first begin to perceive the Use and Expediency of Pauses in Discourse.

But besides this Reason for pausing, which may be called a Motive of Necessity, he remarks, that there are three other Kinds of Pauses, equally useful both to the Speaker and Hearer.

As to the Objects of a Discourse, he says, “ they should be all represented
“ distinct and without Confusion; and
“ consequently require to be separated by
“ some Kind of Interval. Let us consider them as they are found in Nature,
“ or in a Picture; not one but has its
“ Line of Circumscription, which bounds
“ it

“ it and separates it from every other Ob-
“ ject. And is it to be imagined, that in a
“ Discourse, which is a moving Picture
“ coloured in the most exact and regular
“ Manner, they ought not to be drawn
“ separately, and distinguished from each
“ other in the same Manner as in a Piece
“ of Painting?

“ Though the Pause of the Objects re-
“ presented is very easily confounded with
“ that of the Mind which represents
“ them, and this without Danger of
“ prejudicing the Number of the Dis-
“ course, nevertheless the Mind has its
“ Pause peculiar to itself, and quite
“ distinct from that of the Object.

“ Like a Painter, it draws its Strokes
“ one after another, whence they must
“ necessarily be separated from one another
“ by some Kind of Space or Interval.
“ There are three Operations of the
“ Mind; Idea, Judgment, and Reason-
“ ing. Each of these is terminated by a
“ Pause. When the Mind confines itself
“ to an Idea, there is a Pause after this
“ Idea. When it would form a Judg-
“ ment, there is likewise a Pause after
“ this Judgment. Lastly, there is ano-
“ ther

238 *Of Pause, Cadence, Tone and Gesture.*

“ ther Pause after the Reasoning. Be-
 “ sides this, the Judgment when com-
 “ plex, and every Reasoning in general
 “ has its half Pauses and Quarter-Pauses,
 “ which are distinguished by the Punc-
 “ tuation : for Example : *Youth, Beauty,*
 “ *and Riches, are perishable Goods.*

“ The Ear has also its Pauses, which
 “ occur after a certain Space of Time, and
 “ are as so many Points, terminating a
 “ certain Succession of Times, and mark-
 “ ing the Instant of Commencement of
 “ another Succession. These Pauses are
 “ very evident in Music, which is always
 “ distributed by Phrases, Demi-Phrases,
 “ and Measures. A Succession of Sounds,
 “ without their proper Divisions and
 “ Compartments, would quickly tire the
 “ Ear, or at least cease to afford it any
 “ Exercise. *Numerus in continuatione*
 “ *nullus est.*

“ A few Examples will presently ex-
 “ plain all that has been said. *This young*
 “ *Plant, thus watered with the Dews of*
 “ *Heaven, was not long without bringing*
 “ *forth Fruit.* In this Phrase there is but
 “ one Pause marked, which is that where
 “ the full Stop is. Nevertheless there is
 a Pause

" a Pause after *Plant*, another after
" *Heaven*, and another after *long*. And
" to pronounce it properly, there should
" be some Space or Division observed.
" We may breathe after *Heaven*, but then
" this is but an half Pause, the Mind not
" being at the End or Boundary of its
" Operation till after *Fruit*. There is a
" Pause for the Object after *Plant*, and
" another after *long*; there is one for the
" Respiration after *Heaven*, and, lastly,
" another for the Mind after *Fruit*. The
" Pause of the Object, and that of the
" Respiration, are blended together in that
" of the Mind, which still continues its
" Progress, though the Objects are di-
" vided, and the Pronunciation stops
" to give breathing Time: this occasions
" a Variety. At length these three
" Pauses all fall into one another at the
" full Stop, where the Succession of Ob-
" jects finishes, the Respiration remains
" free, and the Mind is at the End of its
" Career."

As to the Pauses of the Ear, the Abbé
observes, that they depend either on
Rhime, as in modern Verse, or in the
Observance

Observance of harmonious Intervals, as in numerous Prose.

In regard to the Distance at which these Pauses are to be placed, he says, that in Poetry it is to be determined incontestibly according to the Necessity of Respiration and the Laws of Taste. And that in Prose we ought to follow the same Rules. This, it is true, is cutting the Matter very short; but with regard to myself, I cannot help thinking that a good Speaker would chuse to have always some more graceful Motive, at least apparently, for pausing, than a Necessity of fetching Breath. For this, however indispensable, should be made to coincide, if possible, with some other Motive. And as to referring the Réciter of Poetry to the Laws of Taste; however incontestible may be their Decision, we are not the less at a Loss to know where that Criterion is to be found.

My Lord Kaims follows the Abbé in a great Measure, in his Distinction of the Pauses; dividing them in the same Manner, into Pauses and Semi-Pauses, with much apparent Accuracy. But I cannot help thinking that much of what hath
been

been advanced on this Head, is futile and frivolous: His Lordship, indeed, hath entered very ingeniously into an Enquiry what Words may be separated by a Pause, and what are incapable of such a Separation.

My Readers will be obliged to me for substituting his Lordship's Remarks, instead of what I might offer to the same Purpose, on this curious Subject.

The first verbal Relation that presents itself, says his Lordship, " is that of Ad-
" jective and Substantive, being the Re-
" lation of Substance and Quality, the
" most intimate of all: and with respect
" to such intimate Companions, the
" Question is, Whether they can bear to
" be separated by a Pause? What occurs
" is, that a Quality cannot exist inde-
" pendent of a Substance, nor is it sepa-
" rable from it even in Imagination,
" because they make Parts of the same
" Idea; and for that Reason, with re-
" spect to Melody as well as Sense, it
" must be disagreeable to bestow upon
" the Adjective a Sort of independent
" Existence, by interjecting a Pause be-
" twixt it and its Substantive. I cannot
R there-

342 *Of Pause, Cadence, Tone and Gesture.*

“ therefore approve the following Lines,
 “ nor any of the Sort; for to my Taste
 “ they are harsh and unpleasant.

Of Thousand bright || Innhabitants of Air——

The Sprites of fiery || Termagants inflame——

The rest, his many-colour'd || Robe conceal'd——

The same, his ancient || personage to deck——

Ev'n here, where frozen || Chastity retires——

I sit, with sad || Civility, I read——

Back to my native || Moderation slide——

Or shall we ev'ry || Decency confound, &c.——

“ Considering this Matter in a super-
 “ ficial View, one might be apt to ima-
 “ gine, that it must be the same, whether
 “ the Adjective go first, which is the na-
 “ tural Order, or the Substantive, which
 “ is indulged by the Laws of Inversion.
 “ But we soon discover this to be a Mis-
 “ take: Colour, for Example, cannot
 “ be conceived independent of the Sur-
 “ face coloured; but a Tree may be con-
 “ ceived, as growing in a certain Spot,
 “ as of a certain Kind, and as spreading
 “ its extended Branches all around, with-
 “ out ever thinking of its Colour. In a
 “ Word, a Subject may be considered
 “ with

“ with some of its Qualities independent
“ of others ; though we cannot form an
“ Image of any single Quality independent
“ of the Subject. Thus then,
“ though an Adjective named first be
“ inseparable from the Substantive, the
“ Proposition does not reciprocate: An
“ Image can be formed of the Substantive
“ independent of the Adjective ;
“ and for that Reason, they may be separated
“ by a Pause, when the former is
“ introduced before the latter :

For thee, the Fates || severely kind ordain——

And curs'd with Hearts || unknowing how to yield——

“ The Verb and Adverb are precisely
“ in the same Condition with the Substantive
“ and Adjective. An Adverb,
“ which expresses a certain Modification
“ of the Action expressed by the Verb,
“ is not separable from it even in Imagination ;
“ and therefore I must also give
“ up the following Lines,

And which it much || becomes you to forget——

'Tis one Thing madly || to disperse my Store——

“ But an Action may be conceived leaving
“ out a particular Modification, precisely

344 *Of Pause, Cadence, Tone and Gesture.*

“ as a Subject may be conceived leaving
“ out a particular Quality ; and therefore
“ when by Inversion the Verb is first in-
“ troduced, it has no bad Effect to inter-
“ ject a Pause betwixt it and the Adverb
“ which follows.

“ The Agent and its Action come next,
“ expressed in Grammar by the active
“ Substantive and its Verb. Betwixt
“ these, placed in their natural Order,
“ there is no Difficulty of interjecting a
“ Pause : An active Being is not always
“ in Motion; and therefore it is easily se-
“ parable in Idea from its Action : when
“ in a Sentence the Substantive takes the
“ Lead, we know not that Action is to
“ follow ; and as Rest must precede the
“ Commencement of Motion, this Inter-
“ val is a proper Opportunity for a Pause.
“ But when by Inversion the Verb is
“ placed first, is it lawful to separate it
“ by a Pause from the active Substantive ?
“ I answer, not, because an Action is not
“ in Idea separable from the Agent, more
“ than a Quality from the Substance to
“ which it belongs.”

His Lordship proceeds to remark, that
in like Manner the active Verb and the
passive

passive Substantive, placed in what he calls their natural Order, that is, the Verb preceding the Substantive, must not be separated by a Pause; and that, on the other hand, when the passive Substantive is first named, there is no Difficulty or Impropriety in interjecting a Pause betwixt it and the Verb.

On this Head he makes the following general Observations, viz. that the natural Order * of placing the active Substantive and its Verb, is more friendly to a Pause than the inverted Order: but that in all the other Connections, Invention affords by far a better Opportunity for a Pause.

As to Words connected by Conjunctions and Prepositions, his Lordship justly observes, they admit freely of a Pause. Connecting Particles, says he, were invented to unite in a Period two Substantives signifying Things occasionally united in the Thought, but which have no natural Union: and betwixt two Things not only separable in Idea, but really distinct, the Mind, for the sake of Melody,

* His Lordship had called it, with more Propriety, the habitual Order, for the Reasons given in the first Section of the succeeding Chapter.

cheerfully admits, by a Pause, a momentary Disjunction of their occasional Union.

With regard to Conjunctions, Prepositions, Articles, and such like Accessories, passing under the Name of Particles; Lord Kaims lays it down as a Rule, that they are of themselves mere Cyphers, and cannot be separated by any Pause from the Words that render them significant.

It is a great Pity that, in his treating this Subject, his Lordship was all the while labouring to support a false Hypothesis; by acceding to the Necessity of there being always a Pause in the Middle of an Heroic Verse or Line: For hence it happens, that the Examples he adduces, by no Means prove the Rules he lays down. If he had always stuck by his Opinion, "That the Pause in the Melody cannot be in better Company than with a Pause in the Sense," and had carried on his Investigation of the Nature and Place of the Pauses with that View, I am persuaded he would have been more successful in this ingenious Enquiry, than he has been.

It is very true, that many of the Lines he cites, as exceptionable, are not poetical; but it is not because their Sense will
not

not admit of a Pause exactly in the Middle of the Line; but because they either will not admit of any Pause at all, and are therefore too long for a poetic Measure, or they admit of so many Pauses as to divide the Line into Parts too short to flow.

Thus the following Lines;

These Madmen ever hurt the Church or State,——

How shall we fill a Library with Wit.——

What better teach a Foreigner the Tongue?——

are not exceptionable or unpoetical merely because the Sense doth not admit of a Pause, as his Lordship observes, after the Words *hurt*, *jell*, and *teach*; but because they admit of no Pause at all.

Again, the following Lines have one Period in each too long for a Measure, and one too short, and thus are rendered unpoetical by the Contrast.

Sure, if I spare the Minister, no rules——

Taste, that eternal Wanderer, which flies——

No such Objection can be made to this Line,

For Spirits, freed from mortal Laws, with Ease——&c.

And yet it will not admit of a Pause in the Middle.

What his Lordship observes, with regard to the concluding Pause of the Couplet, is indeed true with respect to all others, whether in Prose or Verse, "that they never can be graceful, unless " when they accompany a Pause in the " Sense."

Hence it is pretty evident, after all that hath been written upon the Subject of numerous Composition, oratorical Periods and poetical Measures, that the Pauses required in Reading may be marked by the common Modes of Punctuation used by Writers.

The Abbé Batteux confesses, indeed, that the Pauses of Respiration and those of the Mind may be distinguished by the Punctuation; although those of the Objects, when they do not fall in with those of the Mind, cannot be distinguished by any sensible Mark in Writing; nor yet in Pronunciation, but by a particular Tone or Inflection of the Voice, or certain hardly perceptible Breaks, *quasdam impressiones*, which are directed only by Taste, or by a clear and distinct Manner natural to the Person who is speaking. And hence it is, says the Abbé, that we
meet

meet with so few People capable of reading so as to give their Hearers Pleasure and Satisfaction.

Mr. Sheridan, in treating the Subject of Pauses, appears to be as justly sensible as Batteux, of the Use of Tones to regulate the Pauses.

It is evident, says he, that to mark the Stops properly in Writing, every perceptible Cessation of Sound in the Voice ought to have a Mark; but this is far from being the Case in the present Practice of Punctuation, continual Instances occurring, where the Voice ought to be suspended, without any Comma appearing; and Instances as frequent, where Commas are put down in Places, where there ought to be no Suspension of the Voice. The Truth is, the modern Art of Punctuation was not taken from the Art of Speaking, which was never studied by the Moderns, but was in a great Measure regulated by the Rules of Grammar; that is, certain Parts of Speech are kept together, and others divided by Stops, according to their grammatical Construction, often without Reference

meet

to

350 *Of Pause, Cadence, Tone and Gesture.*

“ to the Pauses used in Discourse. And
“ the only general Rule, by which Pauses
“ can be regulated, has been either un-
“ known, or unattended to: which is,
“ that Pauses in general depend upon
“ Emphasis.”

In other Words it depends on the Sense.
But of what Nature is this Dependence?
and how is it pointed out by the Em-
phasis?

I have before shewn that, taking *Tone*
in its strictest Sense, it relates solely to
the Key of the Voice; but we change
this only as the Subject of the Discourse
changes, and that only at the End of Sen-
tences, or very distinct Parts of Sentences;
such *Tone* regarding only the Subject in
general, and not particular Words.

If we consider *Tone* and *Cadence* in a
looser Sense, as a Variation from loud to
soft, it is very certain that the Nature of
the Pauses are determined by such Va-
riation much more than by their different
Length of Time*.

Mr.

* These Variations, as Mr. Sheridan very justly ob-
serves, declaring what Kind the Pauses are of at the In-
stant they are made; and inform the Mind what it is to
expect

Mr. Sheridan's Rule, therefore, for making proper Pauses, is not an improper

expect from them; whether the Sense is still to be continued in the same Sentence; whether the succeeding one is to be the last Member of the Sentence; whether more are to ensue; or whether the Sentence be closed, and a new one is to begin.

The great Utility of this Practice will appear, continues Mr. Sheridan, when we consider how necessary it is that the Hearer should be able to accompany the Speaker in all that he utters, so as fully to comprehend his Meaning; and therefore he should be spared the Trouble of attending to any thing else, but his Meaning. Now if Pauses had no other Mark of Distinction, but the Time of their Duration, it is evident that not only the Speaker, must always be exceedingly nice, in observing the exactest Proportion of Time, with regard to the different Pauses, (a Thing scarce practicable in irregular Discourse) but the Hearer also must employ his whole Attention, during those Pauses, in measuring their exact Duration, without which he must mistake their Nature; a thing equally impracticable, or which if attempted, must by this Distraction of the Attention, do great Injury to the principal Point in View, a full Conception of the Meaning. Whereas, when the Nature or kind of Pause is declared at its Beginning, by the sure Mark of a Note or Tone of the Voice, it matters not afterwards to the Hearer, whether the Speaker observes any due Proportion of Time or not; for he is at that Instant prepared to accompany him, whenever he pleases to set out; whether it be suddenly, or whether he chuses to delay longer than is necessary. For he knows by the Tone what the Pause should be, whether the Speaker observes the due Proportion of Time or not.

one,

one, though it is little more than referring the Reader to his own Judgment, concerning the Modes of Voice most proper to express the Sense of what he reads.

“ Whoever therefore has a Mind, says
 “ he, to read any Piece correctly, must
 “ stop according to this Rule. Let him
 “ first find out and mark each emphatic
 “ Word; then let him examine what
 “ Number of Words belong to that emphatic
 “ one, and at the last of those let
 “ him place a Comma, or such other
 “ Stop as the Sense requires. The Tones
 “ appertaining to these Pauses, and the
 “ Time taken up in them, must be left to
 “ his own Judgment; and his best Rule
 “ will be to reflect what Tones he would
 “ use, and what Time he would suspend
 “ his Voice, were he to speak them as his
 “ own immediate Sentiments, And whoever
 “ ever reads any thing at Sight, would do
 “ well to pay as little Regard to the Stops
 “ as possible, and be chiefly attentive to
 “ the Meaning of the Words.”

For my own Part, I do not see any Possibility of communicating sufficient Rules for the Management of the Voice

in

in this Particular; unless it may be done *viva voce* by a good Speaker.

Even in this Case, however, there is Danger of the Learner's being a mere Mimic of the particular Sounds of his Master's *Voice*; without acquiring a Knowledge of the general Mode of Expression. For, though we may determine what Words are to be emphasized, and the comparative Stresses to be laid on them, yet different People have very different Modes of laying the same Stresses, or giving the same Degree of Significance to Words. Nay, the same Persons frequently express the same Words, equally significantly, in very different Tones. Whoever remembers the various Methods in which Mr. Quin spoke the same Speeches, particularly in the Character of Sir John Falstaff, will need no farther Conviction of what is advanced in this Particular.

With regard to those Kinds of Tones, that, accompanied with Gesture, form the Language of the Passions, which is the same in all Nations and Countries, and is in a Manner independent of articulate Sounds, it is foreign to the Design of the present Essay.

C H A P. IV.

Of the Application of the preceding Rules and Observations to the Recital of the different Species of literary Composition.

SECT. I. *Of grammatical Construction, and the natural Order of Words.*

IT will be necessary, in the Application of the foregoing Rules and Observations, to the Recital of the different Species of literary Composition, not only to begin with the most simple Stile or Mode of Speaking, but also to examine into the very Nature of its Simplicity.

It is generally imagined, that, in our ordinary Discourse, and the common Narrative Stile in Writing, the Words follow each other in a *natural* Order. It will appear, however, on closer Examination, that instead of *natural*, we should say *habitual*: for this Order is different in different Languages; which, it is presumed, would not be the Case, if our Words succeeded each other in the very Order in which

which our Ideas arise, and combine themselves in the Mind*.

The Abbé Batteaux makes a Distinction, indeed, between the Order in which our Ideas arise in the Mind, and that in which they flow from us, when they are annexed to Words, and are arranged in the regular Succession of Discourse. It is this latter which he denominates the natural Order of Words, and which, he says, should be the same in the Narration of Things, as that subsisting in the Things related. There still remains, nevertheless, a considerable Degree of Difficulty in determining what this Order is, or should be. If we would make the Hearer

* Unless, indeed, there be in the Mind, as some have suggested, a Kind of grammatical Arrangement, relative to the Rules established for the Mechanism of the Language in which we intend to express ourselves. A Suggestion by no means improbable, if we reflect on the intimate Connection which Language bears even to Thought: for it is very certain that we study, as well as speak, in some one Language, and that we cannot compose so well in any other. Nay, those who understand a Variety of Languages and Sciences, will tell us, that some Subjects are much better investigated by them in one Language than in another. This is too nice a Discussion, however, to be entered upon in this Place.

consent

consent to what we are saying to him, it is said, we ought to determine the Stations of the Objects by their Degree of Importance; and consequently give the first Place to the Words expressing the most interesting Object.

Agreeable to this Rule, the Critic just mentioned, observes, that the Latin and Greek Languages follow the Order of Nature in their Construction; and that this Order is violated by that of most other Languages.

Be this Matter as it will, the Difference of Construction in various Languages sufficiently proves, that each hath a Mode in some Degree peculiar to itself; which may not improperly be stiled the *idiomatical* Order of such Language. Father Cerceau, it is true, tells us, that “ in the
 “ Latin Construction, provided the Words
 “ which should enter into the Composition
 “ of a Sentence, be there collected, it
 “ is very often of little Importance in
 “ what Order they are placed, and what
 “ Rank they possess: as that which is
 “ placed in the Beginning of the Period,
 “ might as well be placed at the End: so
 “ that by throwing the Words of a Sentence
 tence

“ tence confusedly into a Hat, and drawing them out one after another, like Lottery - Tickets, their Arrangement would be found always sufficiently regular.”

Mr. Sheridan adopts this Opinion concerning the Latin Language; and speaks of it as an Advantage or Perfection in that Tongue; but I cannot help thinking, with Father Cerceau, that it is rather a Disadvantage, or Imperfection, tending to render that Language less precise and intelligible. This casual and adventitious Position of Words, however, is, like the fortuitous Concourse of Atoms, in a great Degree chimerical. It is true that some Languages, and the Latin in particular, admit of a greater Diversity of Transposition than others: But notwithstanding the Latitude allowed them in this Respect, in rhetorical and poetical Composition, it is certain that the Latin, as well as all other Languages, hath an idiomatical Succession, or Order of Words, in the Style of common Discourse, and simple Narration, which is in a great Degree peculiar to itself.

S

With

With regard to modern Languages, it is certain they have not only an idiomatical Arrangement of Words peculiar to each, but their Modes of Transposition are also equally peculiar; while some of them, particularly the French, will hardly admit of any Transposition of Words at all.

Now one of the first and most indispensable Qualifications in the Reader of any Language, is a perfect Knowledge in the idiomatical Order of its Words in common Discourse and simple Narration. Indeed, the grammatical Construction of modern Tongues, depends so much on this Order of Succession in the Words, that they will by no Means admit of arbitrary Transposition; without being rendered equivocal or unintelligible. In Latin, it matters little whether it should be written *Patrem filius amat*, or *Filius patrem amat*. It is still *The Son doth love the Sire*, and cannot be misconstrued; but if, instead of writing according to the simple Mode of Expression in English, the Words should be transposed, and we should write *The Son the Sire doth love*, or *The Sire the Son doth love*, the Sentence would be equivocal.

The

The Study of Variety in Stile, and Pomp of Diction, hath led many Writers into equivocal Modes of Expression; while others again have fallen into it through mere Carelessness and Inattention*. The first Beauty of Stile, however, is Propriety, without which all Ornament is puerile and superfluous. The same may be said of the Recital of what is written.

Now the Transposition of Words being very common in our Language, and sometimes even in our ordinary Discourse, by way of rendering it more significant†, it behoves the Reader to be well apprised of the idiomatical Order of Words, and of all the allowed Modes of Transposition.

Nothing indeed is more necessary to qualify the Reader to repeat what is laid before him at Sight, and of Course to facilitate his entering into the Author's Meaning,

* Lord Kaimes adduces a number of Examples, in his Elements of Criticism, to shew that our best Writers have not duly attended to the proper Arrangement of Words: By which means the Sense hath been rendered doubtful and equivocal.

† Thus, in simply indicating my Intention to go home, I should say, *I must go home*. If my design were opposed, it would be idiomatically enforced by the Transposition, *Home I must go*.

than such a general Acquaintance with the idiomatical Modes of Expression, and the usual Arrangement of Words. It is from a Knowledge of this Arrangement, that the Auditor so readily accompanies, and sometimes even anticipates the Meaning of the Speaker; as it is from the same Knowledge that the Speaker is enabled to deliver his Sentiments with Care and Fluency. Without this, he might have what Plenty or Choice of Words he pleased, he would never be able to speak his own Sentiments, or repeat those of others, with Grace or Propriety.

Hence it is that Foreigners, even after having acquired a *copia verborum* and a tolerable Pronunciation of particular Words, yet speak in a very different Manner from the Natives. The French and English differ but little in this Respect, as the Arrangement of their Words, in common Discourse, is nearly the same. But the German and Low-Dutch use a Number of Parentheses, and generally close their Sentences, in Imitation of the Latin, with a Verb, that governs the whole; so that their Periods are supported with a more equal Tenour of Voice, and generally

rally close with a full and bold Sound : Whereas the French and English usually bringing out their least significant Words last, drop their Voice towards the latter End of their Sentences, and close them feebly. The Effect of this Habit is very evident in their Repeating and Speaking Latin ; in which most other Nations have the Advantage over them, for this Reason perhaps more than any other.

Persons conversant in many Languages, will take upon them to sometimes determine what Language another speaks, although they should not be near enough to hear a single Syllable articulately ; being sufficiently informed by the general Cadence of the Voice in Discourse. Indeed the Difficulty seems not to be very great ; as there must be a sensible Difference between the Tenour of Voice pronouncing the German Periods of a Mile, and the perpetual Catches and Breaks, that are inseparable from the Shreds and Patches of a French *tête à tête*.

As to the Acquisition of this Knowledge of the idiomatical Order of Expression, Natives of a good Education are
S 3 fel-

feldom at a loss in *Speaking*, and by a due Attention to the Stile of the most simple, precise and elegant Writers, may attain all that is necessary to enable them to profit by it in *Reading*.

With regard to Foreigners, indeed, it is necessary that they should be instructed in the particular Influence, which the idiomatical Order, and the Transposition of our Words, have on the grammatical Construction of the Sentence they compose. But this is not the Place to enter upon so copious a Subject.

SECT II. *Of simple Narrative, or mere Relation.*

As Narrative is a mere Declaration, or simple Exposition of a Fact or Event; the Manner of reciting it will necessarily depend on the Nature of such Event; as should also the Stile in which it is recited. Thus a Narrative may be either grave and solemn, chearful and lively, droll or serious, important or indifferent: in all which Cases, the Manner of reciting, as well as the Language in which it is related, should be adapted to the Subject. At the same Time, however, a most perfect Simplicity is to be observed throughout:

out ; No Declamation, no Pathos whatever, being required in the mere Relation of a Fact ; the Knowledge of which only is intended to be conveyed to the Reader. But, if we except the dry uninteresting Articles of our common News-Papers, with the tedious Details of mere Matter-of-Fact Historians, we shall find so little of this Kind of Writing, that, considering it the most easy of all Kinds of Reading, it is needless to dwell upon the Mode of its Recital.

It is, indeed, hardly possible for a Writer, of the least spark of Genius or Imagination, to relate the Circumstances of a Fact or Event, without describing something of the Characters or Scene of Action : All that is requisite therefore to be said on this Subject, belongs with more Propriety to the following Section.

It may not be improper, however, to observe, that there is a wide Difference between *Simplicity* and *Familiarity* ; a Circumstance in which our Declaimers are so very frequently mistaken. They cannot descend from the *pompous*, without sinking into the vulgar ; both of which

ought to be equally avoided in the Recital of indifferent Subjects,

Nothing can be more ridiculous than the affected Aims of Dignity and Importance, with which most Readers recite oratorical and poetical Composition. Thus the most insignificant Message, if couched under the Form of a Couplet, or hitched into Blank-Verses, is delivered by the buskined Valets of the Theatre, with as much Solemnity and Importance, as the most pathetic Passages in a Tragedy.

On the other hand, I have seen some Actors, aware of the Impropriety, run into the other Extreme; and affecting Ease and Simplicity, converse, in the Characters of Heroes, of the Fate of Kingdoms, with as much Familiarity as if they were chatting of theatrical Affairs in the Green-Room.

I remember, in particular, to have heard the whole Audience burst into an immoderate Peal of Laughter, on *Romeo's* saying to his Man—*You know my Lodging*; so excessively ludicrous did a familiar Tone of Voice make this short Sentence. I well remember also, that, to avoid the like Error, the next Time the Cha-

Character was played by the same Actor, he pronounced these Words in as plaintive and sad a Tone as if the Circumstance itself was to be numbered among his greatest Misfortunes.

It is certain that the Transposition of Words, or a Deviation from their idiomatical Order of Succession, will give either an Air of Stiffness or of real Dignity to the Style, and necessarily communicate a seeming Importance to the Voice of the Speaker *. But if the Subject itself be trivial, the Speaker should endeavour to remedy the Defect of the Writer; by giving as little Importance to the Words as possible in Pronunciation. On the other hand, if any interesting or important Circumstance should be related in a creeping, vulgar, idiomatical Style, it

* A very little Reflection will serve to convince the Reader what an Effect this different Arrangement of Words must have on the Manner of Speaking and Reading. For, though the Transposition of Words can never vary the Place of the Emphatic, unless the Meaning be also altered by such Transposition; yet it is very plain that the general Mode of pronouncing the Sentence will be altered; as is exemplified particularly in our Repetitions of Blank-Verse, which, if well written, cannot be recited in the same familiar Tone and Cadence as common Discourse.

would

would be proper, in the Recital, to give it all the Dignity of a precise and full Pronunciation,

SECT. III. *Of Description.*

It is remarkable, with regard to verbal Descriptions, that some of the finest in the English Language are to be met with in our Dramatic Poems; and, at the same Time, that these Passages are those whose Beauty the Actor is least capable of communicating to an Audience. Nay, so extremely difficult is it to recite most verbal Descriptions with tolerable Success, that we have seen Actors, capable of managing our Passions as they pleased, hardly capable of rendering themselves intelligible, in reciting the mere descriptive Passages that occurred in their Parts.

That this Difficulty does not arise from any Defect in the Descriptions themselves, is evident from the Effect which they have on the Reader, perusing them in Silence. Is it that the Analogy between Poetry and Painting is confined to written Language; and that the same Images
are

are not so readily excited by the Sound, as by the Sight of the Words expressing them? This really seems to be the Case; with respect at least to the Description of inanimate Scenes. As to animated Scenes, indeed, the Voice seems, on the other hand, to be the peculiar Language of the Passions*; while the Sight appears to be more immediately adapted to the Understanding.

But this Suggestion is merely speculative. One Reason, I presume, for the Incapacity of public Speakers to describe inanimate Scenes to their Audience, is a mistaken Attempt to convey, by artful Pronunciation, such Images as the verbal Descriptions excite in their own Minds, to those of their Auditors. There is so little Similitude, however, between the Objects, as well as the Senses, of *Sight* and *Hearing*, that this Artifice defeats its own End. To perceive the Beauty of an inanimate Description, the Scene must actually rise up in the Imagi-

* Agreeable to this Notion, I remember to have heard a celebrated Critic offer to wager, that, Mrs. Cibber would bring Tears into the Eyes of her Audience, by repeating, in her Tragic Strain, a Paragraph from the Daily Advertiser.

nation, which it does in Conformity to the visual Faculty; so that the Sound of the Voice is in most Cases * hurtful to the

* Some may chuse to except those in which the Effects of Sound are described; as the Voice may be supposed to assist the Similitude or Imitation intended by the Poet. For my Part, however, I have always thought even these Resemblances better conceived than represented.

Nobody is insensible of the Similitude between the Sense and Sound, in perusing many Passages of our Poets; but it would rather create Disgust, than serve to heighten the Similitude, if the Reader should affect to roar like the Waves in reciting,

*But when loud Surges lash the sounding Shore,
The hoarse rough Verse should like a Torrent roar.*

Again, how ridiculous to attempt to *ruffle, crackle and crash*, like a falling Oak, in reciting

*Loud Sounds the Ax, redoubling Strokes on Strokes;
On all Sides round the Forest hurls her Oaks
Headlong. Deep-echoing groan the Tickets brown,
Then RUSTLING, CRACKLING, CRASHING, thunder down.*

A Resemblance between inarticulate and articulate Sounds may be much better conceived than practised; as the imagined Beauty will almost always turn out a real Defect, it being inconsistent with the very Purpose of Speech, to render it less intelligible by the Imitation of inarticulate Sounds. It is almost impossible in the distinct Pronunciation of the following Lines, to preserve the Sound of a Bow-String therein imitated.

—The String let fly,
Twang'd short and sharp, like the shrill Swallows cry.
readi-

readiness and clearness of our Conception; the bare Words only exciting the requisite Ideas, while the Ear is amused with a Sensation foreign to the Nature of the Object, and thence the Attention is divided; which in silent Reading is directed to one Sense only.

It is in vain for the Reader, therefore, to think of conveying Descriptions of inanimate Scenes, more forcibly to the Hearer, by any Artifice of Pronunciation*. The Resemblance which the Im-

* How absurdly have I heard some Declaimers attempt to heighten the Description in the following Lines of Shakespear, by affecting alternately to *hum* and *whisper* out their Words, as those Circumstances were described!

From Camp to Camp, through the foul Womb of Night,
The Hum of either Army stilly Sounds,
That the fixt Centinels almost receive
The secret Whispers of each other's Watch.

Nay, I have known some, not despicable Actors, make an accordant Motion with their Hands, in repeating

The Armourers, accomplishing the Knights
With busy Hammers closing Rivets up; &c.

At which the Audience have sometimes laughed, with as much Propriety, as they do at Jobson's hammering the old Shoe, when he sings

And then Her Soul at Heaven's Gate
Did knock——most mightily.

pressions,

pressions, made by some Words, bear to that of the Objects or Ideas they express*, should not mislead the Reader to endeavour to heighten that Resemblance, by any Mimickry that may obscure the Articulation. The Passions, as is before observed, may be affected with Tones and inarticulate Sounds; but Images cannot be excited in the Imagination, or Sentiments conveyed to the Understanding, without distinct and precise Words. Hence it follows, that the most simple Modes of Pronunciation should be used in the Recital of such Descriptions.

It is, therefore, with great Propriety that the simple Narrative and Description of inanimate Scenes are, in the ancient Drama, put into the Mouths of the Chorus; who, not being interested as Characters in the Play, are supposed to be divested of Passion, and more capable of such distinct Relation.

In the Recital of animated or pathetic Descriptions the Case is otherwise; and it is not improper for the Reader to be, or *seem* affected by the Passion he describes:

* See Kaim's Elements of Criticism. Vol. II. p. 353.

always observing, however, that his own Sensibility should be subservient to that of the Hearer. For if he be himself so much affected, as to be incapable of that Precision of Recital which is necessary to convey the like Affections to the Audience, he of Course defeats his own Purpose.

I have known some young Tragedians enter so feelingly into their Parts, that they have been choaked up with Passion in the most pathetic Scenes; so that they could hardly get a Word out of their Mouths. Among the Comic Actors also, I have known some so intent upon the Humour of their Part, that they have concealed the Jest from the Audience by their own Laughter.

I shall cite here some favourite Descriptions, both of the passionate and dispassionate Kind, that the Reader may more fully comprehend the Application intended.

Of all the unimpassioned Descriptions that are to be met with in our English Poets, the following of the Gate of Paradise, in the 4th Book of Milton's Paradise Lost, is perhaps one of the most concise and magnificent.

The

——— The setting Sun
 Slowly descended, and with right Aspect
 Against the eastern Gate of *Paradise*
 Level'd his Evening Rays: It was a Rock
 Of *Alabaster*, piled up to the Clouds,
 Conspicuous far, winding with one Ascent
 Accessible from Earth, one Entrance high;
 The Rest was craggy Cliff, that overhung
 Still as it rose, impossible to climb.
 Betwixt these rocky Pillars Gabriel sat,
 Chief of the angelic Guards, awaiting Night;
 About him exercis'd heroic Games
 Th' unarmed Youth of Heav'n, but nigh at Hand
 Celestial Armoury, Shields, Helms, and Spears,
 Hung high, with *Diamond* flaming, and with *Gold*.

The Grandeur of the Object here described, is apt to make the unexperienced Reader assume a loud or pompous Tone of Voice in reciting it. It is to be observed, however, that, as the Stress of Voice is made Use of to express the Passions, we should be very cautious to distinguish between the *Pathos* and mere Dignity. I remember to have heard a famous Disclaimer recite this Passage, with as much Self-sufficiency and Exultation as if he himself had been the Architect of the Pillars and Entrance described. It is impossible, indeed, to represent *that* to others,

of

of which we entertain not a competent Idea ourselves, as well in Reading as in Writing. The Description of the Writer may be as just as it will, the Reader who recites his Words, without having an Idea of the Object described, will be in a great Degree unintelligible. That which is difficult for us to conceive, also, will be difficult for us to convey to others; Hence the utmost Degree of Clearness and Precision ought to be observed in such Recital. At the same Time the Reader should distinguish between the *Interest* and *Attention* of his Hearers. When the Auditor is really *interested* he will attend of course; but his *Attention* may be kept on the stretch to an high Degree, without his being interested at all. Descriptions of inanimate Scenes, and still Life, being seldom very interesting, care should be taken to avoid every Affectation of making them so; for by exciting the Passions, when we should only engage the Attention, our Design is defeated. A Mock-Interest bewilders the Attention of the Hearer, and renders every Thing we say unintelligible.

T

Such

Such mistaken Declamation is like the contemptible Oratory of an antick Mountebank, or modern Auctioneer, calculated only to impose on the Ignorant by pompous Descriptions of Trifles.

It is true, that sometimes the most simple Descriptions cannot be read, or recited, without exciting the Sensations of Delight, Terror, Disgust, &c. which they were intended to excite. But as the Reader should convey these Sensations with the Ideas of the Objects to the Hearer; he ought to prevent the former taking such hold of his Sensibility, as to obscure, or hinder his Communication of the latter.

When Persons read to themselves they may indulge this Sensibility as far as they please, as it arises from their Attention to the Objects described: but in reciting such Descriptions to others, they should consider only the effect of their Recital on their Hearers; to engage whose Attention to the Objects is the Business of the Reader.

Who can read the Description of Sin and Death in *Paradise Lost*, with many Passages in *Spenser's Fairy Queen*, and in
other

other Poems, without Horror and Disgust? But if, in reciting them to others, we should express all we feel, we might disgust our Hearers indeed, but we should not be able to give them a true Idea of the Object of that Disgust. In a Word, the Understanding should always be informed, or the Imagination employed, before the Passions are excited.

It is an Error, founded on the misconstrued Maxim of Horace, *se vis me flere* &c. to suppose it the Business of a Reciter, Orator, or even Player, to be really affected with their own Discourse. It is not requisite that a Tragedian should stand blubbering, or a Comedian sniggering behind the Scenes, till he receives his Cue. We go to a Tragedy or Comedy to cry or laugh ourselves, at the Distress of a Lear, or the Humour of a Falstaff; and not at the Tears of a Powel, or the Grimace of a Shuter. I do not mean by this, that the Reader should stifle the appearance of Sensibility; he ought to have it all; and this, I presume, is as much as Horace meant.

Who can recite the following Description, without all the Appearance of that

Complacency, which the silent Perusal of
it naturally inspires.

So pass'd they naked on, nor shunn'd the Sight
Of God or Angel, for they thought no Ill:
So Hand in Hand they pass'd, the loveliest Pair
That ever since in Love's Embraces met;
Adam the goodliest Man of Men since born
His Sons, the fairest of her Daughters Eve.
Under a Tuft of Shade, that on a Green
Stood whispering soft, by a fresh Fountain Side
They sat them down; and after no more Toil
Of their sweet gardening Labour than suffic'd
To recommend cool Zephyr, and made Ease
More easy, wholesome Thirst and Appetite
More grateful, to their Supper Fruits they fell;
Nectarine Fruits; which the compliant Boughs
Yielded them, Side-long as they sat recline
On the soft downy Bank damask'd with Flowers.
The savoury Pulp they chew, and in the Rind
Still as they thirsted scoop the brimming Stream:
Nor gentle Purpose, nor endearing Smiles
Wanted, nor youthful Dalliance as befits
Fair Couple, link'd in happy nuptial League,
Alone as they. About them frisking play'd
All Beasts of th' Earth, since wild, and of all Chase
In Wood or Wilderness, Forest or Den.
Sporting the Lion ramp'd, and in his Paw
Dandled the Kid; Bears, Tigers, Ounces, Pards,
Gambol'd before them; th' unwieldy Elephant
To make them Mirth us'd all his Might, and wreath'd
His hise Proboscis; close the Serpent fly
Insinuating, wove with Gordian Twine
His breaded Train; and of his fatal Guile

Gave

Gave Proof *unheeded*. Others on the *Grass*
Couch'd, and now *fill'd* with *Pasture* gazing fat,
Or bedward *ruminating*; for the *Sun*,
Declin'd, was *hasting* now with *prone Career*
To th' *Ocean Isles*, and in th' *ascending Scale*
Of *Heav'n* the *Stars* that usher *Evening* rose :

It is yet certain, that, if the Complacence which this Description must naturally inspire, should work upon the Reader the Effects of Exultation, it would serve only to render him less intelligible; all the Passions, whether of Joy, Sorrow, Rage, or Fear, being destructive of Articulation.

Now, though an Orator engaged in a bad Cause, or an Actor reciting Nonsense, may find it expedient to employ Artifice to excite the Persuasion or Passion in the Audience, which a just Idea of his Declamation would not inspire; yet this is not the Business of a just and faithful Reciter. He should endeavour always to keep himself perfectly calm, and assume the Appearance only of such Passions as naturally arise from the Subject. It were, otherwise, impossible for him to make those frequent Transitions from Mirth to Sadness, from Anger to Submission, from

Love to Hate, &c. as the Change of Subject in Reading requires.

When the Heart is really affected, it is impossible for us to shift Appearances easily; nor can the Tongue, which really falters through Fear, either properly describe the Cause of it, or stop its Palpitation immediately, to assume the firm and steadfast Voice of Resolution and Fortitude.

Hence it is plain, that in reciting all Kinds of Description, whether of Still-Life, or Passion, the Reader should endeavour to possess himself of just Ideas of the Objects described, and to affect only such Passions and Emotions which such Descriptions will really excite in the Heart of the Hearer.

But here I must desire the Reader not to forget that I am speaking of the Recital of what is *written*, and not of *extempore Delivery*. In the latter, the Imagination and the Passions reciprocally operate on each other; but, when the Imagination is not upon *Invention*, and hath nothing more to do than barely to conceive what is laid before the Eye, or presented by Memory to the Mind, our own
 Passions

Passions should be quite tranquil, to enable us to assume and diversify their Appearance in reciting to others.

SECT. IV. Of Preaching, Pleading, and other publick Speaking.

Much hath been objected against the Clergy of the Church of England, on account of their *Reading* Sermons, instead of Speaking them *extempore*. The same Rules, however, have been laid down for Preaching in both Cases, although very different ones are requisite. In a Treatise on the Art of Preaching, now before me is the following Passage; tending to invalidate most of what is advanced in the preceding Section.

“ Be Master of your Subject, and as it
 “ were *inspired* with it; and then Light
 “ and Order will naturally dawn upon it:
 “ Every thing will fall into the Place
 “ which becomes it best: One Part will
 “ introduce another, just at the time that
 “ the Minds of the Audience are pre-
 “ pared to receive it; and what follows
 “ will support and fortify that which
 “ went before: The more plain and sim-

“ ple Truths will pave the Way to the
“ more abstruse and complex ones; and
“ the Proofs or Illustrations will still rise,
“ one above the other, in a regular and
“ easy Gradation, till the whole Force
“ of Conviction breaks upon the Mind,
“ and now allows you fair Scope to play
“ upon every tender and passionate String,
“ that belongs to the Heart of Man.
“ Then be sure to *feel* every Sentiment
“ yourself, and to enter first into every
“ Passion you want to communicate to
“ Others: And unless your Imagination
“ plays its Part very ill, the boldest Pi-
“ gures, the strongest Images, and the
“ most moving Expressions will pour in
“ upon you, and animate your whole
“ Discourse and Manner with such Life
“ and Spirit, as cannot fail of winding up
“ the Hearer's Mind to the utmost Pitch
“ of Attention and of Passion. If you
“ are thoroughly touched with the Im-
“ portance and Dignity of the great Sub-
“ jects of Religion and Virtue, you will
“ not be ambitious of the Reputation of
“ *fine Speakers*, nor study the little Orna-
“ ments of a *gaudy* Eloquence, such as
“ pretty Similes, strained Antitheses, po-
lished

“lished Periods, and the Play of Wit or
“Words. I am far from discouraging
“the closest Study and Application of
“Mind to one’s Subject, previous to the
“appearing in public: But a great deal
“must be left to the extemporary Efforts
“of Nature, when the Speaker is enli-
“vened with all the animating Circum-
“stances which attend public Speaking.
“That Man who has ranged every
“Thought, measured every Sentence,
“Transition, and Circumstance of his
“Discourse, and settled the whole Me-
“thod of his Delivery in his Closet, may
“be indeed an elegant and correct Speak-
“er; but I will venture to say, he can
“never be a popular and powerful Ora-
“tor: He will fall into a cold phlegma-
“tic Manner of Speaking; or if he throw
“himself into a forced Heat, it will ap-
“pear artificial, or else evaporate in a te-
“dious insipid Sameness of Voice and Ac-
“tion; either of which are the dead
“Weights of genuine Eloquence. Where-
“as if the Speaker be thoroughly en-
“lightened and warmed with his Subject,
“and feels *himself* the Passion he means
“to inspire, *Nature*, in that case will
“sug-

" suggest the most becoming Ornaments,
 " and significant Phrases; will vary the
 " Tone of the Voice according to the
 " Rises and Falls, and different Turns of
 " the Passion; and, in fine, will animate
 " with the most expressive Air, Look,
 " and Action, according to the several
 " Feelings and Movements of the Mind.
 " For *Nature* and *Passion* are more able
 " Prompters than the most eminent Ma-
 " sters of Elocution.—Such a Speaker,
 " with all his Repetitions, Breaks, Inac-
 " curacies, and Chasms in Discourse, will
 " force his way, through all Opposition,
 " into the Bowels and Soul of the Hearer,
 " and will kindle and set on fire his whole
 " Frame; whilst your smooth and studied
 " Declaimer will send him away as cool
 " and unmoved as he found him."

Now, I agree with this Author, that in
 extempore Delivery, the Passions may be
 really affected, in Order to excite the
 Imagination to Invention; but I cannot
 agree that, because extempore preaching
 would thence be more *animated*, it would
 therefore be the *best*. It is by no means
 likely that the Passions should direct the
 Speaker in the most proper Form and Ar-
 range-

rangement of the several Parts of his Discourse; which is necessary to engage the Understanding, and thereby throw the *Force of Conviction* on the Mind. The Mind is not convicted every Time the Heart is affected.

If the Purpose of a Sermon, indeed, were, like that of a theatrical Entertainment, calculated merely to amuse us, by sporting with the Passions, the extempore Method might be preferable; but I am persuaded that a truly pious rational Divine, would rather dismiss his Hearers *coolly convinced* of the Truth, and *stedfastly determined* to Religion, than *warmly persuaded* by his Eloquence, or enraptured by a transitory Fit of Devotion.

It is further much more probable that the Matter and Composition of a *written* Discourse, should be preferable to an *extempore* one; nor is there any Likelihood that the Advantage, which the latter may reap from the more animated Manner of Delivery, should compensate for its other Defects. Add to this, that there is no *Necessity* for the Reader of a Sermon to have a less animated Delivery, than he who composes one as he delivers it. That most
Readers

Readers of Sermons have actually an *in-
animated* Method of reciting, is no Argu-
ment that *they* must be so. It is the *Ap-
pearance* of Passion that affects the Hearer;
not the *Reality* of it: So that there is no
Necessity, as before observed, for the Re-
citer to be really affected. If there be, and
Nature and *Passion* are, as this Writer as-
serts, more able Prompters than the most
able Masters of Elocution, I should be
glad to know what becomes of the *Art* he
professes to *teach*.

But I presume it is needless to dwell
longer on this Subject; as the Clergy have
almost universally adopted the Custom of
reciting written Sermons.

The Mode of Recital is adopted also
more and more in other Species of public
Speaking. Our Barristers, (at least the
most unexperienced and least retentive of
them) plead from written Briefs: Nay,
it sometimes happens, that the senato-
rial Flow of Eloquence itself is interrup-
ted, and even privileged Tongues are ob-
liged to have Recourse to mental Lucu-
brations.

The great End of all public Speaking
is effected in two Modes; viz. those of

Con-

Conviction and Persuasion. The former of these is directed immediately to the Understanding, and the latter directly to the Heart. The former hath also this Advantage, that it always involves the latter: For we are ever fully persuaded of the Truth of what we are convinced of; though we are not, on the other hand, always convinced of the Truth of what we are persuaded to. A little Reflexion oft unravels the persuasive Sophistry of the most seductive Rhetorician; but the Force of the convincing Arguments of a Logician lasts as long as our Remembrance of them. Hence, it is evident, that with regard to any lasting Purpose, one Demonstration, like those of Euclid, is superior to all the forcible and flowery Declamations of a Demosthenes or a Cicero.

As to the temporary Purposes of carrying a Point in Parliament, a Cause in Westminster Hall, or establishing a Doctrine in the Church, when those Purposes serve only to gratify the private Inclination or Interest of the Speaker; it is a Matter foreign to the Principles of just Elocution. Sinister Ends must be attained by

by false and artificial Means. Thus, if a Lawyer be engaged in a bad Cause, it is the Trick of his Profession to prevent its appearing to the Court in its true Light. If he is to plead from a defective Brief, it is his Business to hurry inarticulately over the weaker Passages, and to dwell with Plainness and Precision on the stronger. It is the same in all Cases. When demonstrative Truth is the Object, we cannot address ourselves better than to the Understanding; when we would persuade People into a Belief of what is problematical or false, we must address ourselves to their Passions; which cannot be done better than by confounding their Understandings.

It was from a Sense of this, that the greatest Judges of Oratory in the World, the Athenians, silenced the Voice of Declamation in the Areopagus. It is with Pleasure, also, that I have sometimes observed the venerable Judges of our Courts put a Stop to the *saucy Tongue of rattling Eloquence*, when it hath been wandering from the Point in hand. For by such Declamations it is that Falsehood and Injustice

justice obtain their transitory * Advantages. It would, doubtless, be agreeable to every Individual, to have the Art of working upon the Passions of Mankind as he pleased, and of persuading them to believe whatever he should tell them: But surely such an Art, as it might be the most seductive, would be the most dangerous of all others. If the Person possessed of it were not the most virtuous of Mankind, to what pernicious Purposes might he not employ so fascinating, so powerful an Art? Nor would this Art be unsuccessful among an ignorant People, whose unenlightened Understandings should be no Check on their Passions.

* Hence Acts of Parliament are frequently passed only to be repealed; and Orders of Court are made only to be reversed. When their Duration is short, they are attended with slight Inconveniences to the Publick; but the Practice on which they rise, is often of the most fatal Consequence to Individuals. Should the Judge of a Court of Equity, neglecting the Evidence that ascertains the State of the Case before him, be prevailed on to listen by the half Hour, to an illiberal Pleader, who, instead of Speaking to the Point in Hand, should only lavish Abuse on the Party interested; and should such Judge upon this, retract his former Opinion of the Case itself, and pronounce him in the wrong whom a Pleader dares to Calumniate; what might not be the Consequence!

As

As among a civilized and enlightened People, however, any Attempt to impose on their Understandings should be treated with Contempt; I consider the Art of Elocution as it is addressed to the Understanding, and by means of that to the Heart. The true Art of Speaking or Reading, is to affect the Passions by informing the Mind, and not by confounding the Imagination.

On this Supposition, therefore, that the Preacher, Pleader, or other Orator, means only to recommend the Truth, his first Business is to labour to convince; as, having done this, he need be under no Apprehension that his Discourse will be totally ineffectual; which he may justly fear if he hath only attempted to persuade. In one Case, a little Reflection may undo all he hath said; but in the other, the longer People reflect, the more firmly are they persuaded of its Truth. How often hath the Oratory of a Pulteney or a Pitt bore down all Opposition while they were speaking; every Man in the House appearing persuaded of what they advanced, and ready to give his Assent? And yet, when the Larum was run down,
and

and their Auditors were permitted to reflect, how often hath the Question been carried against them?

The Effects are similar with regard to the Eloquence of the Church. Nothing is more common than for an eloquent Preacher to set his Hearers exulting at the Joys of Heaven, and shuddering at the Terrors of Hell; whom he never could possibly convince of the Existence of either one or the other. The Consequence is, that in the present Case, as soon as the Hearer goes out of Church, his Emotions, whether of Joy or Terror, subside, and he frequently acts as before, just as if what he had been hearing described, existed only in the Imagination of the Preacher.

Now, I will venture to say, that could a clear and precise, (though cold and unimpassioned) Demonstration of the Existence of the Things described, be given, it would have a more lasting and powerful Effect, than all the glowing Colours of their Description.

The Conclusion which is to be drawn from these Reflections, is evident. The public Speaker, who addresses the Passions

U

instead

instead of the Understanding, either means to deceive, or is ignorant of the most effectual Method of recommending what he hath to offer to the Publick. A Mathematician never attempts to persuade any body to believe in the Propositions of Euclid; why then should Orators, if equally sensible of the Truth of what they advance, attempt to persuade, when it would be so much more effectual to convince? All Subjects, it is true, are not equally capable of Demonstration; but they are capable of Evidence; and every Man has a Right to require that Evidence on which another believes, when he would persuade us to believe too. It is, indeed, the highest Affront to his Auditors, for an Orator to address himself to their Passions, by any other Method than through their Understanding.

SECT. V. *Of Theatrical Declamation, or the Art of reciting dramatic Compositions.*

To treat of this Subject so fully as it requires, would itself take up a Volume; I shall here take notice, therefore, only of those Particulars in which the Recital
of

of dramatic Compositions differs from that of others.

In the Recital of mere Narratives, of Descriptions, and of argumentative or persuasive Discourses, the Reader stands in the Place, and speaks in the Person of the Writer; but in the Rehearsal of Conversation-Pieces, he must diversify not only his Mode of reciting, in Conformity to the Subject, but also in Conformity to the Character. Thus the same Narrative and Description, if spoken by different Personages, must be differently recited. Will it be said, "this is to require the Reader to be an Actor, and to assume the different Characters of the Scene?" Not at all. A Reader is not required to wear a Hump with King Richard, nor a great Belly with Sir John Falstaff: Nay, he is not required even to saw the Air with his Hands, to make Faces, to laugh, to cry, nor indeed take any one Step in order to make the Hearer think him a Person of the Drama.

Any Attempt of this Kind would be ridiculous; for, speaking alternately the Language of the whole *Dramatis Personæ*, he

cannot impose himself on the Imagination of the Auditor for either.

So far, however, as Language and Sentiment are concerned, the Reader may, and it is requisite that he should, observe the Distinction of Situation and Character. The same Sentiments are not only delivered differently by different Personages, but are delivered variously in various Circumstances and Situations.

With what Difference are the same Apostrophes uttered by Shylock and Gratiano in the Merchant of Venice!

The former, with all the carping Eager-ness of a cruel Mind intent on Revenge, cries out, when the Cause seemed to go in his Favour,

*A Daniel come to Judgment! Yea a Daniel!
O Wise young Judge!—O learned Judge! &c.*

When the Decree goes against him, Gratiano, with all the Exultation of a generous Mind relieved from the Load of his Friend's Distress, tinctured with a Mixture of deserved Reproach, reminds him of his former Expressions.

*O learned Judge! Mark Jew! A Daniel, Jew!
A second Daniel! A Daniel, Jew!*

Now

Now Infidel I have thee on the Hip.—

A DANIEL, *still* say I, a *second Daniel*!

I thank Thee Jew, for teaching me that Word.

It happens, indeed, not unfrequently, that the Poet himself neglects these Distinctions of Character and Circumstance, in which Case, the Passage can hardly be recited with Propriety. Thus, if a ludicrous Sentiment, or Description, should come from a grave Personage in Circumstances of great Distress; a tedious Tale be put into the Mouth of another in great Haste; a solemn Argument into that of a Jester, &c. the Impropriety would be evident; as it would be impossible for the Reader to enforce the Sentiment, without violating the general Character, or the particular Situation of the Speaker. The minute Description of the miserable Apothecary, and his wretched Apparatus of empty Boxes, in *Romeo and Juliet*, I have always thought too inconsistent with the distracted and desperate Situation of *Romeo**. The same Objection may be

* Agreeable to this, his Appearance on the Stage generally raises a loud Laugh, doubtless an ill-timed one, in the Audience.—

made to the mincing Phrases, which Shakespear (if they are really his) puts into the Mouth of Hotspur, in describing the Petit Maitre that came dress'd like a Popinjay to ask for his Prisoners. I know this Description hath been justified as Characteristic of Hotspur; but its Minuteness and Length offend against the Time, Place and Circumstance of the Scene.

No Narrative or Description is, on the other hand, better introduced in this respect than Mercutio's Raillery about Queen Mab, in the first Act of Romeo and Juliet; Casca's Relation of Caesar's refusing the Crown when offered him by the People; Falstaff's Description of his ragged Regiment; with many others, that might be selected from Shakespear †.

† This last mentioned Description is so extremely beautiful in itself, so consistent with the Character of the Speaker, the Time, Place, &c. that I cannot resist the Temptation of citing it.

Fal. If I be not asham'd of my Soldiers, I am a sowe'd Gurnet: I have mis-us'd the King's Press damnably. I have got, in exchange of an hundred and fifty Soldiers, three hundred and odd POUNDS. I press me none but good Houholders, Ycomens Sons; enquire me out contracted Bachelors, such as had been ask'd twice on the Banns: Such a Commodity of warm Slaves, as had as lieve hear the De-

vil,

As to the Recital of what may be strictly called Dialogue, it so nearly resembles common Conversation, that nothing more is necessary than to acquire a just Idea of the Character that speaks, the true Sense

vil, as a Drum; such as fear the Report of a Caliver, worse than a struck Fowl, or a hurt Wild-Duck. I press me none but such Toasts and Butter, with Hearts in their Bellies no bigger than Pins Heads, and they have bought out their Services: And now my whole Charge consists of Ancients, Corporals, Lieutenants, Gentlemen of Companies, Slaves as ragged as LAZARUS in the painted Cloth; and such as indeed were never Soldiers, but discarded unjust Serving-Men, younger Sons to younger Brothers; revolted Tapsters, and Ostlers Trade-fall'n, the Cankers of a calm World and long Peace; and such have I to fill up the Rooms of them that have bought out their Services; that you would think, I had a Hundred and Fifty tatter'd Pradigals, lately come from Swine-keeping, from eating Druff and Husks. A mad Fellow met me on the Way, and told me, I had unloaded all the Gibbets, and prest the dead Bodies. No Eye hath seen such Scare-Crows: I'll not march through Coventry with them, that's flat. Nay, and the Villains march wide betwixt the Legs, as if they had Gyves on; for, indeed, I had the most of them out of Prison. There's but a Shirt and a half in all my Company; and the half Shirt is two Napkins tack'd together, and thrown over the Shoulders like a Herald's Coat without Sleeves; and the Shirt, to say the Truth, stol'n from my Host of St. Albans; or the red nos'd Inn-keeper of Daintry. But that's all one, they'll find Linen enough on every Hedge.

of what he says, and a Knowledge of the Circumstances of the Scene.

To one Thing, indeed, the Reader ought to be particularly attentive, in reciting dramatic Composition; and this is, never to address himself to the Audience. The supposed Speakers converse with each other, and not with a third Person; the Reader should therefore repeat their Discourse as if they were still speaking.

There is no Species of Writing more pleasing than that which presents us with a true Copy of Conversation. When the Persons are noble, the Subject important, and the Spirit of Altercation well supported, it is the most interesting and affecting of all others. The Scene between Brutus and Cassius, as represented in Shakespear's Julius Cæsar, should be the Model for all Writers of Dialogue; as the Recital of it is the Test of all accomplished Readers. I make no Apology, therefore, for inserting it here, as well by way of Exercise to their Talents, as to give them a perfect Idea of what I mean by that true Spirit of Altercation which should animate all dramatic Composition, and distinguish Dialogue from Declamation.

Brutus

Brutus and Cassius.

Cas. That you have wrong'd me doth appear in this,
You have condemn'd and noted *Lucius Pella*,
For taking Bribes here of the *Sardians*;
Wherein, my Letter (praying on his Side,
Because I knew the Man,) was slighted of.

Bru. You wrong'd YOURSELF, to write in such a Case,

Cas. In such a Time as this, it is not meet
That every nice Offence should bear its Comment.

Bru. Yet let me tell you, *Cassius*, you YOURSELF
Are much condemn'd to have an itching Palm;
To sell, and mart your Offices for Gold
To Undeservers.

Cas. I an itching Palm?
You know that you are *BRUTUS*, that speak this;
Or, by the Gods, this Speech were else your last,

Bru. The Name of *CASSIUS* honours this Corruption,
And Chastisement doth therefore bid it its Head,

Cas. Chastisement!

Bru. Remember *MARCH*, the *IDES* of *MARCH* remember!
Did not great *JULIUS* bleed for Justice Sake?
What Villain touch'd his Body, that did stab,
And not for Justice? What, shall one of us,
That struck the foremost Man of all this World,
But for supporting Robbers; shall we now
Contaminate our Fingers with base Bribes?
And sell the mighty Space of our large Honours
For so much Trash, as may be grasped thus? —
I had rather be a Dog, and bay the Moon,
Than such a Roman.

Cas. *Brutus*, SAY NOT ME,
I'll not endure it; you forget yourself,
To hedge me in; I am a Soldier, I,
Older in Practice, abler than yourself
To make Conditions.

Bru.

Bru. Go to ; you are not, *Cassius*.

Cas. I AM.

Bru. I say you are not.

Cas. Urge me no more, I shall forget myself—

Have mine upon your Healths—tempt me no farther.

Bru. Away, slight Man.

Cas. Is't possible—

Bru. Hear me, for I will speak.

Must I give Way and Room to your rash Choler ?

Shall I be frightened, when a mad Man stares ?

Cas. O Gods ! ye Gods ! must I endure all this ?

Bru. All this ! ay MORE. Fret, till your proud Heart break,

Go show your Slaves how choleric you are,

And make your BOND MEN tremble. Must I budge ?

Must I observe you ? must I stand and crouch

Under your testy Humour ? By the Gods,

You shall digest the Venom of your Spleen,

Tho' it do split you. For, from this Day forth,

I'll use you for my Mirth, yea, for my Laughter,

When you are waspish.

Cas. Is it come to this ?

Bru. You say, you are a better Soldier ;

Let it appear so ; make your Vaunting TRUE,

And it shall please me well. For mine own Part,

I shall be glad to learn of noble Men.

Cas. You wrong me every Way—you wrong me, *Brutus* ;

I said, an ELDER Soldier ; not a BETTER.

Did I say, better ?

Bru. If you did, I care not.

Cas. When *CÆSAR* liv'd, he durst not thus have mov'd me.

Bru. Peace, Peace, you durst not so have tempted him.

Cas. I DURST not !—

Bru. No.

Cas. What ? durst not tempt him ?

Bru. For your Life you durst not.

Cas.

Cas. Do not presume too much upon my Love;
I may do that I shall be sorry for.

Bru. You have done that you should be sorry for.
There is no Terror, *Cassius*, in your Threats;
For I am arm'd so strong in Honesty,
That they pass by me, as the idle Wind,
Which I respect not. I did send to you
For certain Sums of Gold, which you deny'd me;
For I can raise no Money by vile Means;
By Heaven, I had rather coin my Heart,
And drop my Blood for Drachmas, than to wring
From the hard Hands of Peasants their vile Trash,
By any Indirection. I did send
To you for Gold to pay my Legions,
Which you denied me; was that done like *CASSIUS*?
Should I have answer'd *CAIUS CASSIUS* so?
When *Marcus Brutus* grows so covetous,
To lock such rascal Counters from his Friends,
Be ready, Gods, with all your Thunderbolts,
Dash him to Pieces!

Cas. I deny'd you not,

Bru. You did.

Cas. I did not——he was but a Fool,
That brought my Answer back.—*Brutus* hath riv'd my Heart,
A Friend should bear a Friend's Infirmities,
But *Brutus* makes mine greater than they are.

Bru. I do not, till you practise them on me.

Cas. You love me not.

Bru. I do not like your Faults.

Cas. A friendly Eye could never see such Faults.

Bru. A Flatterer's would not, tho' they do appear.
As huge as high Olympus.

Cas. Come, *ANTONY*, and young *OCTAVIUS*, come;
Revenge yourselves alone on *Cassius*,
For *Cassius* is a-weary of the World;
Hated by one he loves; brav'd by his Brother;

Check'd

Check'd like a Bandman; all his Faults observ'd
Set in a Note Book, learn'd and comm'd by Rose,
To cast into my Teeth: O I could weep
My Spirit from mine Eyes! — There is my Dagger,
And here my naked Breast — within, a Heart,
Dearer than Plutus' Mine, richer than Gold:
If that thou beest a Roman, take it forth.
I, that deny'd thee Gold, will give my Heart;
Strike, as thou didst at Caesar; for I know,
When thou didst hate him worst, thou lov'dst him better
Than ever thou lov'dst Cassius.
Bru. Sheath your Dagger;
Be angry when you will, it shall have Scope;
Do what you will, Dishonour shall be Honour.
O Cassius, you are yoked with a Lumb,
That carries Anger, as the Flint bears Fire;
Who, much enforced, shews a hasty Spark,
And straight is cold again.

There is still a Part of dramatic Composition unmentioned; in the Recital of which the Reader may find some Difficulty; as it is that, in which our Poets and Players betray most Defects. This is the *Soliloquy*. By the disagreeable and defective Manner, in which Soliloquies are usually written and spoken, it seems as if there were a peculiar Difficulty in recording, or reciting a Man's Conversation with himself. But can it be greater than that of copying our Conversation with each other?

Some

Some Critics have objected to the Introduction of Soliloquies in the Drama; but they have not supported their Objections by sufficient Arguments. The noble Author of the Elements of Criticism, after justifying their Use in general, observes in particular, that Shakespear's Soliloquies may be justly established as a Model; it not being easy to conceive any Model more perfect. He contents himself with citing as a Proof, the two following, of very different Kinds. The first is the first Soliloquy of Hamlet.

*Ham. O that this too, too solid Flesh would melt,
Thaw, and resolve itself into a Dew!
Or that the Everlasting had not fix'd
His Cannon 'gainst Self-Murder:
How weary, stale, and unprofitable
Seem to me all the Uses of this World!
Fie on't! O fie! 'tis an unweeded Garden
That grows to Seed; Things rank and gross in Nature
Possess it meerly. That it should come to this!
But two Months dead? Nay, not so much! not two—
So excellent a King, that was to this,
Hyperion to a Satyr: So loving to my Mother,
That he permitted not the Winds of Heaven
Visit her Face too roughly! Heaven and Earth!
Must I remember?—Why, she would hang on him,
As if Increase of Appetite had grown
By what it fed on; yet within a Month!—
Let me not think—Frailty, thy Name is Woman!*

*A little Month! — or e'er those Shoes were old,
 With which she follow'd my poor Father's Body,
 Like Niobe, all Tears! — Why she, even she —
 O Heav'n! A Beast that wants Discourse of Reason
 Would have mourn'd longer! — married with mine Uncle;
 My Father's Brother; but no more like my Father,
 Than I to Hercules.
 It is not, nor it cannot come to Good.
 But break, my Heart, for I must hold my Tongue.*

The second is the Soliloquy of Mr. Ford, in the third Act of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*:

*Ford. Hum! ha! Is this a Vision? Is this a DREAM?
 Do I SLEEP? Master Ford, AWAKE, awake, Master
 Ford; there's a Hole made in your best Coat, Master Ford;
 this 'tis to be married! this 'tis to have Linen and Buck-
 Baskets! Well, I will proclaim myself what I am; I will
 now take the Leacher; he is at my House; he cannot 'scape
 me; 'tis impossible he should; he cannot creep into a Half-
 penny Purse, nor into a Pepper Box. But lest the Devil
 that guides him should aid him, I will search impossible
 Places; tho' what I am, I cannot avoid, yet to be what I
 would not, shall not make me tame; if I have Horns to
 make one mad, let the Proverb go with me, I'll be horn
 mad.*

Both these Soliloquies, Lord Kaims ob-
 serves “are accurate Copies of Nature:
 “In a passionate Soliloquy one begins
 “with thinking aloud: And the strongest
 “Feelings only are expressed: As the
 “Speaker

“ Speaker warms, he begins to imagine
“ one listening, and gradually slides into
“ a connected Discourse.”

It is a trite Maxim among the Critics, adopted by Mr. Pope and others, that all Soliloquies should be short and passionate. But the Impropriety, if there be any, lies in thinking aloud, or talking to one's self in any Case. Is it less excusable for People to laugh by themselves, than to cry by themselves? Or is it not as natural for us to talk to ourselves when we are pleased, as when we are vexed? Doubtless it is; the Question then comes to this, “ what
“ Degree of Pleasure, Mirth or Interest
“ is necessary to open our Mouths, or is
“ equivalent to so much Grief or Resent-
“ ment? What Reason can be given,
“ why Falstaff might not divert himself,
“ by laughing aloud in his Description of
“ his ragged Regiment above-quoted, as
“ well as Hamlet recapitulate the Cir-
“ cumstances of his Mother's Marriage
“ with his Uncle, or Mr. Ford perplex
“ himself aloud with the Apprehensions
“ of his being made a Cuckold?” The
Author of the Elements of Criticism, in-
deed, admits of Soliloquies upon lively
and

and interesting Subjects, though without any Turbulence of Passion. And that these may either be carried on in a continued Chain of Thoughts, or even in the Way of Dialogue with one's self, if the Subject prompt a Man to think in the Mode of Altercation. As a Proof of this, he cites Falstaff's celebrated Soliloquy on Honour: To which he might have added the following equally to the Purpose.

Fal. IMBOWELL'D!—if thou *imbowel* me to DAY, I'll give you Leave to POWDER me, and EAT me To-morrow! 'twas Time to counterfeit, or that hot Termagant Scot had paid me SCOT and LOT too. COUNTERFEIT? I am no Counterfeit; to DIE, is to be a Counterfeit; for he is but the Counterfeit of a Man, who bath not the Life of a Man: But to counterfeit dying, when a Man thereby liveth, is to be no Counterfeit, but the true and perfect Image of Life, indeed. The better Part of Valour is Discretion; in the which better Part, I have saved my Life. I am afraid of this Gunpowder Percy, though he be dead. How if he shou'd counterfeit too, and rise? I am afraid he would prove the better Counterfeit; therefore I'll make him sure; yea, and I'll swear, I kill'd him. Why may not he rise as well as I? Nothing confutes me but Eyes, and no Body sees me. Therefore, Sirrah, with a new Wound in your Thigh come you along with me.

This is as natural a Soliloquy I believe, as ever was written; but cannot with any Propriety be termed passionate. Let this Matter

Matter stand as it will, however, with regard to the Writer, the Reader should consider that it is just as natural for Men to reason as to rave; he should not take it for granted, therefore, that every Soliloquy he meets with, is to be read with Pathos. He should in this Case, as in all others, endeavour to acquire a just Idea of the Frame of Mind and Disposition of the Speaker, and recite his Words exactly as if he were alone, and talking to himself. To conclude, when the Reader can acquit himself properly of this Species of Recital, he may venture to congratulate himself, on his having overcome the greatest Difficulties in this Art.

A P P E N D I X.

The Sketch of a Plan for establishing a Criterion, by which the Pronunciation of Languages may be ascertained; and, in particular that of the English Tongue, reduced to a Certain fixt Standard.

HAVING been induced, since the Commencement of the foregoing Sheets, to apply my Thoughts concerning Orthoëpy or Pronunciation in general, to the establishing a Criterion for that of the English Language in particular; it is judged expedient to give the Purchasers of this Introduction a short Sketch of that Design: especially, as I have undertaken to carry it into Execution, by the Publication of a *Rhetorical Grammar*; of which the Reader is already informed;

and also of a *Rhetorical Dictionary* * consistent with the same Plan.

The Reader is already made acquainted with the Inconveniencies arising to Foreigners and Provincials, from the absurd Manner in which our English Grammarians divide their Words into Syllables; as also of the Perplexity occasioned even to polished Speakers and Readers, by the Custom of teaching the Prosody of modern Language on the Principles of the Ancients.

There is still one fundamental Error, greater than either of these; which is common to modern Grammarians of all Countries †: This is the Method of teaching the Orthoëpy of a Language, by applying the particular Sounds and Modes of Articulation used in Speech, to written Types common to various Languages, instead of those general written Types, to those Sounds and Modes of Articulation which are peculiar to each Tongue.

* The *Grammar* in one Vol. *Octavo*. To be published as soon as possible. The *Dictionary* in one Vol. *Quarto*. To be published at latest before the end of next Winter.

† Not even Dr. Wallis himself, who investigated this Subject farther than most Writers, was aware of this Error.

Hence

Hence it is, as has been before observed, that different Nations, applying different Sounds and Modes of Articulation to the same Types, find so much Difficulty in acquiring the Pronunciation of the Words of each other's Language. Whereas, if the contrary Method were pursued, and the elementary Sounds and Modes of Articulation peculiar to each Language were first acquired, and the Types, or Combination of Types denoting them, distinctly pointed out, we should need only to make ourselves Masters of those Sounds and Modes, and by turning to a Vocabulary properly compiled, we should know how to apply them with the greatest Exactness.

It will be imagined probably by those who have not examined far into this Subject, that these Sounds and Modes of Articulation are very numerous and various. On the contrary, however, they are but few, and in most European Languages very much alike. It is true, the German, the Low-Dutch, and other Northern Nations, have some guttural Sounds and Modes which the English have not. The French have likewise some palatial, or rather

ther nasal Modes, particularly in the Provinces, which we never use; on the other hand, we have some few aspirated Modes, to which they, as well as most other Nations, are Strangers; of this Kind are the two Modes of Utterance denoted by *T* & *H*. If we except a small Number of these, and something of a general Mode or Tone that affects the whole Discourse, the rest of the elementary Sounds of most European Languages are the same.

With regard to the Number of these primary Elements of Speech, even those Grammarians, who have perceived their Existence, have not treated them with that Accuracy the Case requires. Thus when Buffier takes upon him to say, that there are Twenty-four simple Sounds in the English Language, Twenty in the Spanish, Twenty-nine in the Italian, Thirty in the German, and Thirty-three in the French; he makes no Distinction between distinct Sounds and mere Modes of Articulation; many of which are totally mute. Add to this, that few Persons are capable of judging of the Elements of any but their native Language. It is no Wonder, therefore, if this Author

thor mistook in the Number of simple Sounds of the English; who, are so far from having Twenty-four distinct Sounds, that they have no more than Sixteen. And if we take the simple Modes of Articulation into the Account, they amount both together to above Forty.

It is pretended by some, that the elementary Sounds and Modes of Articulation in the Greek and Latin Languages, exactly answered in Point of Number to that of their Characters or written Types. For my own Part, I can hardly believe this to be true. It is notorious, that the Greeks had various Dialects, as the Attic, the Doric, &c. we find also that several of the Latin Authors were accused of a Patavinity or Provinciality of Expression. Are we to suppose that these Dialects affected only their written Language, and not their Pronunciation or Manner of Speech? Perhaps this Point is not well to be ascertained; considering the Uncertainty the Moderns lie under respecting the Pronunciation of the dead Languages. Be this, however, as it may, certain it is, that in English, neither the Number of the vocal and written Elements are the

same; nor do the same Types constantly express the same Sound or Mode of Articulation. These Circumstances occasion that Perplexity and Confusion in the Orthography of our Language which I propose to use my Endeavours to remove.

To this end, I enquire, first, into the Number and Nature of the simple Elements above-mentioned; which may be generally distinguished into *Sounds*, and *Modes of Articulation*: The former, usually denoted in Writing by Vowels, and the latter, by Consonants. It is to be observed, with regard to this Distinction, however, that, as the Sounds denoted by the Vowels are not equally distinct, but descend gradually from the most clear and acute, to the most dull and obtuse, even to the indistinct and half-articulate; so the Modes of Articulation, indicated by the Consonants, are in the same Manner far from being all equally mute, but arise gradually from the most silent to the most vocal.

The Number of these Sounds, as well as Modes, though greater indeed than that of our written Types, is yet still much less than will at first be imagined;

if

if we reflect on the vast Number of Syllables that may be formed by the various Combinations of the Letters of our Alphabet. For with regard to the vocal Modes of Sound, or that Mode indicated by the Vowels, I have not been able as yet to find one Syllable in all the Words of our Language, as they are pronounced by the most polished Speakers, the Mode of which is not included in some or other of the following Words. *Ball, bar, bard, bail, beel, hell, bit, mile, hot, go, who, cube, cur, toy, good, thou.* If to these Sixteen different distinct Sounds, we add that indistinct Mode in which we generally pronounce the Particles *a* and *the* before a Substantive, as also the last Syllables in such Words as *prison, vocal, bumble, &c.* I believe * we shall have all the elementary Sounds in our Language.

* I say *believe*, because it is possible, in so nice an Investigation, dependent altogether on the Ear, some *one* may have escaped me. I know that Provincials and affected Speakers have several; but as I chuse to found my Criterion of Pronunciation on the universal or general Practice of the most polished Speakers, viz. Men of Letters and Education at Court, it is to the Custom of these only that I have attended in adjusting this Particular.

These

These Sounds, are yet so far from being constantly denoted in Writing by the same Types or Combination of Types, that those Types are not only substituted frequently for one another; but a single Type is often made use of instead of a Combination of Types, and *vice versa*.

Thus the Sound of *ball*, is frequently typified in *maul*, *drawl*, *thought*, *broad*, *absolve*, &c.

That of *Bar*, in *are*.

of *Bard*, in *laugh*.

of *Hail*, in *reign*, *ale*, *day*, *they*, *there*, *bears*.

of *Heel*, in *veal*, *piece*, *machine*, *replete*, *conceive*,

James, &c.

of *Hell*, in *Health*.

of *Hit*, in *yet*, *women*, *busy*, *build*, &c.

of *Mile*, in *why*, *buy*, *boil*,

of *Hot*, in *what*.

of *Go*, in *foe*, *note*, *goat*, *though*, *know*.

of *Who*, in *soup*, *noon*, *prove*.

of *Cube*, in *feud*, *few*, *you*, *clue*, *shoe*.

of *Cur*, in *stir*, *her*, *love*, *won*, *earth*, *blood*,
tough, *were*, *acre*.

of *Tay*, in *toil*.

of *Good*, in *bull*, *could*.

of *Thou*, in *Town*.

In this Specimen alone we see that the Sound of *u* in *Cur*, is in different Words denoted by no less than three different Vowels,

Vowels, and five various Combinations, viz. by *e, i, o, ee, ea, ou, ae, oo*; on the other hand, we see the Letter *a* denote five different Sounds; in *ball, bar, bard, day, what*; while the Combination *ou* hath no less than six different Sounds in *though, soup, you, tough, could, thou*.

In like manner, the Modes of Articulation, usually typified by Consonants, are sometimes expressed by one or more others, whose common Mode is quite different. Thus GH and PH in *Writing*, frequently denote the Power of F in *Speech*: as in *Pharisee, Ralph, laugh, &c.* Again, some Consonants denote two Modes almost equally general; thus C hath both the Power of S and of K, as in *cease, Candle*. G hath sometimes the Power of I or Ch, and at others nearly that of *k* as in *gentle, grant, &c.*

On the other hand, we have many Types that only serve to indicate a greater Aspiration, or an Addition of Force to a Mode expressed by another; thus in the *Labials* B and P, the latter is only stronger or more forcible; differing very little from the former in Point of Mode: The like may be said of the *Dentals* D and T;

Vowels

of

of the *Palatials* G and K; the *Labidentals* V and F; and also of the *Linguidentals* C, S, and Z.

This uncertain Use of the Application of Sounds and Modes of Articulation to written Types, induced a particular Enquiry into the gradual Relations of the several Elements of Speech, as they proceed in the Scale before-mentioned, from the most silent to the most vocal. The Consequence of this Enquiry, was the following Table or Alphabet constructed; in which I have distinguished them, as well as I could, by the Sounds most usually annexed to the Letters. But as it is impossible to convey the respective Elements to the Reader accurately by Letters, I have annexed the Syllables or Words in which they are used. And lest this should be ineffectual, as in some Cases it may, I have severally numbered them, so that good Speakers may ascertain, and communicate them very easily and certainly to others.

N ^o 1	b	as in	bat
2	p	- - -	pat
3	d	- - -	dad
4	t	- - -	tap
5	g	- - -	gag
6	k	- - -	kick, Chorus
7	h	- - -	Hand
8	dh	- - -	then, cloaths
9	th	- - -	thin, Mouth
10	v	- - -	Veal
11	f	- - -	feel
12	y	- - -	yield
13	J	- - -	James, gentle
14	ch	- - -	Chair, Question
15	sh	- - -	Shame, Passion, social, Nation, Machine
16	zh	- - -	Measure, ofier, Confusion
17	z	- - -	Zeal, rose
18	c or s	- - -	cease, hiss, yes
19	l	- - -	Lamb
20	m	- - -	Man
21	n	- - -	Nun
22	r	- - -	run
23	Q	- - -	queer
24	w	- - -	wall.

Such are the simple Modes of Articulation in our Language, indicated, as the Reader will see, chiefly by Consonants. The two last, however, are almost vocal; Q never being written without the Vowel U after it, and W being little more than an obtuse or indistinct Mode of repeating the U. With respect to N^o 1, 2,

or

of *b* and *p*, they are totally silent; differing from each other only in the greater or less Degree, in which we press our Lips together; before we pronounce the Syllable they serve to articulate.

They are of themselves so entirely mute, however, that they admit not of the least Breath to issue from the Mouth, nor are accompanied with the least Sound, nasal or guttural.

At N° 3, 4, or *d* and *t* which differ from each other also nearly in the same Manner as *b* and *p*, the Mouth barely opens; but the Tongue cleaves to the roof of the Mouth just within the upper Teeth, so that they are equally silent.

At N° 5, 6, or *g* and *k* the Mouth opens a little wider, but the Tongue lies equally motionless in the Bottom of the Mouth: So that all these six Modes are from the very Appulse of the Organs necessarily silent.

At N° 7, or *h*, we begin to breathe; or emit the simplest of all the audible Elements of Speech.

N° 8 and 9, or *dh* and *th* are forcible Expressions of the Breath with the Tongue between the Teeth, from which they receive

ceive a kind of Articulation, and might with as great Propriety be called articulate Expirations.

N^o 10 and 11, or *v* and *f*, are of the same Kind, only differently modified between the Teeth and Lips, as the preceding were by the Teeth and Tongue.

In N^o 12, or *y*, the Breath is modelled farther within the Mouth, and begins to to partake of the *Hiss*.*

N^o 13 and 14, or *i* and *ch* are more forcible Expressions of the same Kind, in which the Aspirate is evidently converted in a great measure into an *Hiss*.

N^o 14, 15, 16, are different Compounds of the Aspirate and *Hiss*.

N^o 17 and 18, or *z*, and *c* or *s* are distinct Hissings, occasioned by the forcible Expulsion of the Breath through the Teeth.

N^o 19, 20, 21, 22, or *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, are full Modes of Articulation, accompanied either by a palatial, or a guttural Sound previous to the Articulation of the subse-

* An *Aspirate* differs from an *Hiss*, in that the former is emitted with the Teeth open, and the latter with the Teeth shut.

quent Vowel. Hence they are sometimes called semi-vocal.

N^o 23, 24, are also semi-vocal, and approach very nearly to that indistinct or half articulate Sound, which has been already mentioned, and seems to be a Kind of mean Element between a Consonant and a Vowel.

As to the distinct Sounds or Elements denoted by the Vowels, exemplified above; they proceed gradually from the most dull and obtuse, to the most clear and acute, in the following Order.

- | | | | | | |
|----------------|----|-----|---------|-----|------------------------|
| N ^o | 1 | --- | u | --- | as in cull, cub |
| | 2 | --- | ow | --- | town, noun |
| | 3 | --- | ou | --- | could, bull, good |
| | 4 | --- | oo | --- | noon, group, soup, who |
| | 5 | --- | aw | --- | draw, ball |
| | 6 | --- | ew | --- | few, cube, shoe |
| | 7 | --- | o | --- | not, what, swan |
| | 8 | --- | oe | --- | foe, toe, note |
| | 9 | --- | oi | --- | toil, joy |
| | 10 | --- | aa | --- | hard, command |
| | 11 | --- | a | --- | and, hat |
| | 12 | --- | ae | --- | mate, hail |
| | 13 | --- | e | --- | met |
| | 14 | --- | ee | --- | meet, seat |
| | 15 | --- | i | --- | fit, yes |
| | 16 | --- | ii or y | --- | why, nigh |

Having

Having thus investigated all the simple Sounds and Modes of Articulation peculiar to the English Tongue, it is purposed to ascertain next what Modes of Articulation will admit of their preceding or succeeding each other; and to lay down such Rules, in the projected Grammar, that the Pronunciation of our Language may no longer remain in a State of Confusion and Uncertainty.

Again, to prevent a Multiplicity of Rules from deterring or disgusting the Learner, the Dictionary is so contrived as to shew, at Sight, the exact Pronunciation of every Word, to all such Persons as are capable of uttering the several simple Sounds, and of managing their Organs of Speech, agreeable to the Modes of Articulation abovementioned.

It must be confessed, that so arduous and laborious an Undertaking, as that of establishing a general Criterion for the Pronunciation of the English Language, would better suit the united Abilities of a Society of Academicians, than those of a private Individual. But Geniuses are, for the most Part, too excentric and unruly to become Beasts of Burthen. It is sel-

Y

dom

dom any Number of them can be induced to draw one Way. I am on this Occasion, however, proud to own, that I am not destitute of Assistance, should I stand in Need of it, in the present Attempt; and I appeal to Experience for the Truth of the Observation, that the candid Opinion of one ingenious and learned Friend, is often of more real Importance than the Suffrage of a whole Academy of inattentive or superficial Observers.

23 OC 62

F I N I S.

